LIBRARY
TEACHERS COLLEGE
CITY, TENNESSEE

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 2, 1935 NUMBER 1048

Contents

The Week 203

Editorials

One Insurance Plan—Or Forty-eight?..... 206
Music Costs Money..... 207

General Articles

Facts About Faces: I. Roger Baldwin..Peggy Bacon 209
End of the Conquistadores.....Jonathan Mitchell 210
Security for Americans: VI.....Abraham Epstein 212
On with the Dance (verse).....John Lehmann 215
The Old Guard Never Surrenders....Bergen Evans 216
Washington Notes.....T. R. B. 218
Other People's Money.....John T. Flynn 219
On the Labor Front.....William P. Mangold 220

Correspondence 221

Congratulations .....Stark Young 223

Books in Review

Literature and Politics.....Malcolm Cowley 224
Beard: The Planner.....Henry A. Wallace 225
The Passion of Alex Maury..Andrew Nelson Lytle 227
A Study, Slightly Previous.....Murray Godwin 228
The Christian Soldier.....Robert Morss Lovett 228
Hope Being Abandoned.....William Rollins, Jr. 228
Books in Brief..... 229

The Week

ARMY authorities, in their testimony before the Senate Committee investigating the munitions industry, made quite clear (1) that they are opposed to any further degree of national ownership of munitions plants and (2) that they believe Section 7a of the N.I.R.A. should be abrogated in time of war. Furthermore, they favor export of munitions from this country in time of peace, provided military secrets are not revealed. In effect this means that the army is actively encouraging the making of profit by those who have an interest in armed hostilities, and that it wishes to preserve the profit system in wartime, but that on the other hand it wants to deprive labor of the right to collective bargaining and the right to strike, the moment hostilities break out. In other words, it favors a militarist dictatorship of capital. The reasons advanced of course rest upon the desire to be as efficient a fighting machine as possible. To this end it is desired to have a large and active private munitions industry, and to prevent any possible interruptions of production during hostilities, while keeping down the labor cost of manufacture. This view exemplifies the typical military lack of imagination and short-sightedness. The larger the part of the munitions industry under direct government supervision, the better prepared we should be for an emergency. It is in the arms plants proper that the designs and methods are developed that are of use to the other factories called upon during a war. And of course no war can be long continued without at least the tacit support of labor. Intangibles in this sector are of extreme importance. The attitude of the army is a striking instance of the fact that the very existence of capitalism makes war more likely and threatens democracy.

THE two leading organizations of employers in the country, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the National Association of Manufacturers, have presented to the President their program for recovery. Its major features are: withdrawal of the federal government from unemployment relief and administration of relief on the good old charity basis; postponement of unemployment insurance until we know more about it; balancing of the federal budget in 1935; cessation of all attempts to enforce collective bargaining; dependence mainly on the private construction industry to revive building; private control of the banks and of credit; no government competition with "business"; return to a fixed gold standard and stabilization of international exchange; continuation of government loans to railroads, but on easier terms; continuation of N.R.A. codes only where business wants them and only for the purpose of enforcing the checks on competition, the restriction of output and the price control that business wants. We seem to have heard most of this before. The only elements in it that were not current under the Hoover administration concern those additional favors that the Roosevelt administration has bestowed upon business. If we were living safely somewhere on a tropical island, our idle curiosity would prompt us to want to see what would be the result of this policy if it were adopted.

RECENT opinions expressed by Neville Chamberlain in the House of Commons and Premier Flandin of France illustrate the difficulty of reëstablishing international exchange on a common gold basis. Our

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undervalued with relation to the franc, unless and until prices rise in the United States to a level approximating something like the old purchasing-power parity. In the meantime there is a deflationary pressure upon France; her prices, and those of the other members of the gold bloc, tend to fall as ours delay in rising. If ours do not rise enough, she will eventually be forced to devalue, which she is extremely reluctant to do. Both countries therefore are awaiting the outcome as regards our price level. In the meantime Great Britain and the sterling bloc stand in between, prepared to move in either direction according to circumstances. The British regard the present exchange ratio between the dollar and the pound as unfavorable to them, at our present price level. If our prices rise sufficiently, they would be satisfied to go back to gold at the present ratio, but not otherwise. On the other hand, the ratio between the pound and the franc is favorable to the British. If, as a result of a failure of our prices to rise, France should be forced off gold, the pound would lose this favorable position, and more currency maneuvering by the British would be called for. Therefore they are waiting hopefully for Mr. Roosevelt's price-raising policy to take effect before adopting a fixed course.

SOMETHING extremely serious is evidently going on behind the veil of censorship in Russia. On no other theory can anyone explain the arrests of Zinoviev and Kamenev, and the wholesale execution of others on a scale that inevitably brings to mind Hitler's purge of June 30. The assassination of the Communist leader Kirov has passed completely out of the picture, and what is now suggested is the crushing of an incipient revolution. The Daily Worker, in New York, talks of Russian fascists with headquarters in Connecticut, who are conducting a terrorist campaign across the Russian border at various points; but the news from Moscow is all in another direction. It suggests a degree of internal weakness entirely at variance with all other pictures of the U.S.S.R. that have come in recent years from any sources except those most bitterly hostile to the Soviet regime.

SHELBYVILLE, Tennessee, was the scene last week of an attempted lynching that was met by treatment almost unheard-of in such cases. Governor Hill McAlister ordered out the National Guard, and when the lynchers attempted to storm the jail and get their victim—a Negro named E. K. Harris—they were met with bullets. Several of the mob are dead, others are wounded, and Harris has survived to experience due process of law. Those who died in Shelbyville did not know it, but by their deaths they probably helped the South move toward realization of an important principle—the principle that there should be justice before the law for both black and white. If the lesson is appreciated, they may have helped to save the lives of many innocent men in the future.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, in his old age, has become the most hysterical of the "professional patriots." His newspapers are conducting a great nationwide anti-radical campaign, in which no story is too fantastic to be solemnly served up for his audience of "people who think." Not long ago he sent reporters, in the guise of prospective students, to interview members of the faculty at Syracuse University, and then published a series of daily articles in his Syracuse Journal making red mountains out of pink molehills. We are informed that public indignation among the citizens of Syracuse caused an abrupt cessation of this campaign. Undaunted, Hearst has turned his attention to New York City. The city editor of The New York Evening Journal caused members of his staff to go to Teachers' College and seek to lie their way into the confidence of several members of the faculty there, hoping to obtain material for another sensational exposé. These reporters brazenly admitted that they were supposed to drum up "a Red scare." Their conversations were reported stenographically, and the material has been turned over to the Congressional Committee Investigating Un-American Activities for possible action. A distinguished group of educators has made public protest against this sort of journalism. These educators point out that

> in a time like this we need every help in getting the people to face the serious problems confronting us. Neither cure of depression nor furthering of the progressive measures of national administration can go forward without free discussion and inquiry in the universities and schools. This [the Hearst] campaign threatens both.

IN LAST week's New Republic we commented on a cablegram sent by Ambassador Page to President Wilson on March 5, 1917. This cablegram, as our readers will remember, predicted a crisis in the United States if the Allies were unable to meet their payments on a $400,000,000 loan made through Morgan's and added that "it is not improbable that the only way of maintaining our present preëminent trade position and averting a panic is by declaring war on Germany." The full text of this cablegram was released to the public by the Nye Committee on December 14, 1934. The United Press put the text of the cable into its munitions story of that day. So far as we can learn, The Associated Press, International News Service and Universal Service did not. We have examined some twenty leading papers of the country, both in New York City and elsewhere, and find the following interesting facts: Only four of these papers carried the text of the cable. The New York Post, The New York World-Telegram, The Louisville Courier-Journal and The Pittsburgh Press did so. The Cleveland Plain Dealer carried the U. P. munitions story, but, in the edition that we examined, cut out all mention of the Page message. The New York Herald Tribune printed a denial that the Nye Committee would investigate the cable [illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber of other papers printed a denial of an investigation of Morgan's, but were careful, even in the denial, not to mention the existence of the cable. Is this the freedom of the press about which the publishers have lately been so solicitous?

> From now on, when you visit the stores of one large chain of groceries in this country, you will find canned foods which are labeled to show the quality of the goods you get for the price you pay. . . .

CANNERS and wholesalers were horrified when they read this helpful advice to consumers in a recent issue of The Market Basket, a weekly news letter prepared and published by the Bureau of Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture. Obviously, the statement referred to the decision of the A. & P. chain to use government grades A, B and C on its canned goods. What the canners probably disliked most in The Market Basket was the additional advice to housewives that, with the present kind of labeling on canned foods, "you cannot rely on price as a guide . . . of the four highest-priced brands of canned peas, eight out of fourteen cans were found *not* Grade A as you would expect, but Grade C quality. But now, in the stores of one chain at least, you will be able to tell what you are buying before you take the can home and open it." One of the large wholesale groups promptly informed President Roosevelt that it was "highly inappropriate" for a government bureau to issue such "partisan" (*i.e.,* consumer) advice to the damage of thousands of independent merchants.

MEANWHILE, the canners had further cause for dismay in the defection of the Food and Grocery Chain Stores of America, Inc. This organization, including practically all chain-stores groups except the A. & P. and representing more than 22,000 retail outlets, has just reported to the N.R.A. that it is in favor of having provisions for quality-grade labeling, based on government standards, incorporated in the canning code. It is to be hoped that the N.R.A., with this support from the chains, will now force a showdown. For when President Roosevelt approved the Canners' Code last May, he did so with the specific proviso that the canning industry should formulate standards of quality for its products "within ninety days." The ninety-day period has elapsed, of course, not merely once but twice—with an extra month to spare. And the canners are still unwilling to put genuinely informative labeling on their goods. It would seem about time for the N.R.A. to force them to do so or ask them to give up the privileges of their code.

THE recent conviction and seven-year sentence of Dirk deJonge, Communist and World War Veteran at Portland, Oregon, is another milestone of the Red hunt started during the Pacific Coast longshoremen's strike. DeJonge is one of eight indicted for Criminal Syndicalism violations and the second convicted. Stanley Doyle, past National Commander of the "forty and eight" of the American Legion, acted as special prosecutor in the case "without cost to taxpayers." His services were sponsored by the Commanders' Council, a county federation of the commanders of leading veteran organizations. Jacob Kanzler, district judge who tried the case, is also a prominent Legionnaire. Another organization prominent both in the arrests last July and in the prosecution is the Citizens' Emergency League, which, according to the testimony of one of its members, is a body formed by the Chamber of Commerce during last summer's strike. It is semi-military in nature and advocates armed suppression of radical groups. Testimony brought out the fact that both M. R. Bacon, Red-squad policeman who made the arrests, and his superior, Captain W. Odale, are members. The prosecution's methods included private interviewing of a defense witness, a retired army officer, to persuade him to change his testimony. No mistrial was declared when this episode was brought out in court. The jury, after twenty hours, brought in a ten-to-two verdict for conviction and a unanimous recommendation for clemency.

OCTOBER—November—December: the months slip buy since the settlement of the general textile strike, but all does not seem to be settled even yet. The United Textile Workers, after a three-day convention in New York City last week, voted to notify President Roosevelt that a "conspiracy" exists among textile mills, especially in the South, to discriminate against workers for union activities in defiance of the President's request that such discrimination should cease. It also appears that Francis J. Gorman, vice-president of the union, has reason to be somewhat skeptical of the "victory" that he hailed last September. In many instances, he now declares, no attempt has been made to reinstate the "victims" of the strike.

THE futility of subsidizing an industry that does not exist is demonstrated once more by the results (or rather the lack of them) of the government edict to pay 64½ cents an ounce for domestic-mined silver. On December 21 the silver producers celebrated the first anniversary of this beneficent measure, which overnight boosted the price they received by almost 20 cents an ounce. Estimates of production in 1934, based on figures for the first ten months, indicate no increase in production by United States mines over their output in 1933, when ruinously low prices prevailed. The reason for this failure to respond to the improved market is apparent to everyone familiar with the history of silver mining—there are virtually no silver mines in the United States. Since the World War there has been only one year in which the silver mines produced more than one-third of the entire silver output. The other two-thirds is recovered as a by-product from copper and lead mines. Silver production depends not on the price of silver, but on

LICENSED TO UMI UNDER ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rate of production and the market for copper and lead.

THE decision to pay 64½ cents an ounce for silver last year was an outright subsidy, made to appease the silver Senators led by Key Pittman of Nevada. It certainly could not be justified on any grounds as a move to bolster the national currency system. It makes no difference whether a silver certificate is backed by metal of domestic or foreign origin, yet during 1934 the government has paid $3,400,000 more for 20,000,000 ounces of domestic silver than it would have had to pay for a like quantity of foreign silver. In return for this sum, several lead and copper mines have been able to resume dividends (without increasing either production or employment) and perhaps a handful of miners have been able to return to work at one or two camps in Colorado and Nevada.

STRANGE as it may seem, the California State Chamber of Commerce recently appeared in the unique role of protesting to the N.R.A. on behalf of labor and—perhaps not quite so strange—it won its point. The California Chamber, it appears, was disturbed over the practice of automobile shippers who, desiring to deliver cars to the Coast at minimum expense, were sending them in caravans over the highways under their own power. The drivers of these cars were being recruited from the semi-indigent and "floating" population of the East. Many of them were mere boys, and an N.R.A. report suggests why the California Chamber came to their aid:

> Some of these drivers have testified that they have driven from 3 o'clock in the morning to 11 o'clock at night and that often they were not furnished with money for food. Many had to beg for nourishment, and others were turned loose on the road without shelter. Upon arriving at their destinations they were frequently dismissed, hungry, penniless and exhausted. About 1,000 persons have been added to California relief rolls each month by this practice, according to State Chamber of Commerce estimates.

As a result of the protest, the N.R.A. compliance director of San Francisco has obtained the promise of at least one company—the Studebaker Sales Corporation—that the drivers of its caravans would be put on a "shuttling" basis, paid code wages and offered free transportation back to South Bend.

THIS story is of interest from another angle. During Upton Sinclair's campaign for Governor, California business men attempted to raise a terrific scare over the army of indigent automobilists who were supposed to be invading the state in response to Sinclair's promises. The size of this "army" has since been estimated by the California Registrar of Motor Vehicles to have been less than 15,000. Is it possible that a fourth or more of this contingent could have been unloaded on California by the automobile companies?

One Insurance Plan—Or Forty-eight?

AS THE Committee on Economic Security is about to introduce its long awaited recommendations for federal action on unemployment insurance, it seems essential to bring forward a point of view that has received scant consideration in the public discussion of various proposals and the deliberations of the Committee itself. Why not have a national system of insurance, nationally administered? This may be undesirable or even impossible, but so little attention has been devoted to projects of this nature that the cases for and against them seem not to have been even stated.

When the agitation for unemployment insurance began some years ago, it was natural to assume that in this country it must proceed by state measures. The great depression had not yet shaken and shifted public opinion, and the New Deal legislation had not even been thought of. Federal laws embodying social regulation had been difficult to obtain, and even when they were passed, the temper and habit of the Supreme Court made it likely that they would be declared unconstitutional. It was necessary to agitate for a constitutional amendment before Congress could exercise the right even to regulate child labor. Fewer such constitutional barriers stood in the way of state action, however, and some states, more progressive than others, could move without waiting for the majority. In this way most of our existing social legislation has come into being, and in this way also the one state that has enacted an unemployment-insurance measure—Wisconsin—has been enabled to get what it wanted. Other types of unemployment insurance have been seriously discussed elsewhere, as in Ohio and New York, and have aroused a considerable body of support.

It was quite understandable, therefore, that those chiefly interested should carry over into the new situation the attitude and projects which they had developed under the old. The questions have centered about the possibility of state action. What could the federal government do to encourage the passage of state unemployment-insurance measures? What could it and should it do to establish minimum standards for these measures? If it favored any one type of insurance, which type should it favor? So we have had the Wagner bill, which proposes a special federal tax on employers, the tax to be remitted wherever and to the extent that states should require employer contributions to unemployment insurance. And we have had the alternative proposal that the federal government should give grants-in-aid to states establishing unemployment-insurance measures with approved standards, as it now gives grants-in-aid for roads and other purposes. We have had discussions as to the principles of measures that should be encouraged. Should the reserve funds be raised solely from employers, or should

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the workers contribute also, or should there be a contribution from public treasuries? Should the Wisconsin idea be adopted, making the financial burden of benefit payments dependent on the success of individual concerns in avoiding unemployment, and so attempting to minimize the evil, or should the government stress the insurance feature by pooling the funds from individual firms and industries, and so making possible wider distribution of the risk and larger benefits? In all this discussion, little attention has been paid to the possibility of immediate nationwide insurance by direct federal enactment.

The case for such a measure seems to us persuasive. Few important industries are localized in particular states. Competition in the sale of goods, where it exists, is usually on an interstate basis. Great industrial corporations operate on a national scale. Neither labor organizations nor employer organizations are partitioned by state boundaries in their economic action. Even the labor market is in large degree an interstate one; workers move around the country to find jobs, and may be obliged to do so increasingly in the future. Industries themselves shift about. Under these circumstances it is illogical and wasteful to have some states with no unemployment insurance while others have it, to have a possibility of forty-eight kinds of systems with forty-eight types of administration and requirements, and above all, to have forty-eight—or even more, if the Wisconsin idea be adopted—separate funds, none of which can be called upon to supplement the others, if certain sections of the country should be more heavily hit by unemployment than the rest. A national scheme could, moreover, be linked to better advantage with a national pension and other social-insurance laws.

If advocates of unemployment insurance have been deterred from seeking a national system of this sort by the same considerations that deterred them when years ago they began to agitate, we believe they are misjudging the new political and legal situation. If Congress will pass an effective measure to encourage state action, it would probably pass a federal insurance measure. A Congress that is on the brink of enacting a compulsory thirty-hour week and that might even favor the Townsend pension plan of $200 a month to everyone over sixty would scarcely hesitate at a well drawn unemployment-insurance bill, backed by the weight of expert opinion and with a considerable amount of support from organized labor and even from employers. Nor is there any more likelihood that the Supreme Court would now declare such a law unconstitutional than that it will invalidate the major part of the New Deal legislation. We have cause to believe that some of the leading authorities on constitutional law see no reason why such legislation should be upset by the courts. Indeed, it might even have a better chance than the Wagner taxation plan.

The main practical difficulty, we suspect, is that those near the center of the movement cannot agree among themselves as to what sort of insurance scheme should be favored. Wisconsin does not want to give up its plan of segregating funds by individual employers, while others do not want to accept such a plan. These differences are nationalized by a prevalent type of political philosophy which calls for varied experiments by states, decentralized administration and local responsibility. It is a pity, however, that such variation in experiment should be applied in measures aimed at relieving the workers' insecurity, while the ruling policies of industry which create that insecurity should continue to be decided by nationally powerful economic institutions and habits. Even the most successful statewide experiments are likely to be puny barriers against the risks inherent in a nationally unstable economy. It may be that the differences among the experts cannot now be sufficiently resolved to yield effective support for a federal plan, and consequently that the best we can expect at present is a halfway measure. We register our opinion here and now, however, that no ultimately satisfactory system will be found that is not industrywide and nationwide.

Music Costs Money

THE OPPOSITION of Arturo Toscanini has prevented the merger of the New York Philharmonic-Symphony Society and the Metropolitan Opera and so for the moment has preserved the integrity of concert music in New York City. But the crisis itself is by no means ended by Toscanini's refusal to resort to a poor remedy and one that would undoubtedly have been copied in other cities; for though the crisis comes to its focus in New York City it is general over the whole country.

For some years the unstable combination of art and finance on which orchestras have lived has been threatening to dissolve and leave New York with neither Opera nor Symphony. For a brief time radio seemed to be a practical way out, but this too, has failed and we are now face to face with the question whether costly music can be maintained at all, and if it can be maintained, how and under whose control. The one contribution of radio has been to broaden the responsibility. By its present-day technical perfection it has made New York concerts and opera available to the whole country; it has made New York's musical problem a national responsibility.

The Philharmonic has always run at a loss, but in recent years, under declining subscriptions, its deficits have been steadily mounting. Its problem is how long supporters will be willing and able to put up money for good music. A popular drive last year brought in $500,000, but nearly $150,000 of this was required to cover last year's deficit and the prospect for the present season is for an even greater loss. Nor does there seem any immediate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possibility of raising another half-million by a popular drive.

The problems of the Opera, however, are more complicated. The Philharmonic is a musical organization purely, but among its other functions the Opera is a real-estate corporation and a dispenser of social prestige. The organization is caught between two unpleasant alternatives. It might try to popularize itself with reasonable box-office prices, but this would almost certainly lose it the support of the carriage trade. On the other hand it might play to the diamond horseshoe in a smaller and cheaper house, but then it would be left owning an idle block of real estate and a useless building.

From 1903 to 1930, under the management of Gatti-Casazza, the Opera made money. There may have been complaints now and then about Gatti-Casazza's musical management, but his board of directors had no complaints about having to foot the bills. With the depression, however, these happy times vanished and the men who have had to pay the deficits have been looking around for a way out. Naturally there have been popular-subscription drives, but now there seems no chance for another. There have been earnest hunts for angels, but all angels come with strings. Angels could have saved the real estate, but to accept them would be humiliating. Then there were negotiations with Mr. Rockefeller. Mr. Rockefeller was reported to be ready to bail out the Opera, by building it a new house in Rockefeller Center, but he showed no willingness to carry the Opera's white-elephant real estate—perhaps having more than enough of his own.

In this situation, a merger with the Philharmonic seemed the only way out. The Philharmonic had nearly half a million cash, it had a great and loyal audience. If it could be brought into the Opera House the day might be saved for a while. Despite the fact that the subscribers to the half-million fund had given their money with no thought of helping opera real estate, that the merger would close Carnegie Hall, reduce the number of operas in a season, force the Philharmonic audience to use an acoustically impossible building, form a hybrid opera-symphony orchestra that probably could do justice to neither kind of music—despite these considerations a thin majority of the Philharmonic's directors were willing to support the idea. Fortunately it failed.

With this miserable dickering over real estate, dollars and social prestige, the real world of music has nothing to do. Yet today music must live by these dickers or it does not live at all. When the dickers have finally run themselves out, as perhaps they now have, we are left facing the real problems of music. Symphony concerts are necessarily expensive; opera, by necessity or tradition, is equally so. Neither seems able to pay its own way from the box office. In Europe both have been state-supported for many years.

The radio has enormously broadened the audiences for both opera and symphony but it has not increased their revenues. Both are broadcast, but the Philharmonic, at least, has not found this a worth-while source of income; it has had to broadcast on the sustaining hours, not for a handsome fee from the advertisers. This winter the Metropolitan expects to make nearly $100,000 from its opera broadcasts (sponsored by Listerine) but the Philharmonic gets less than $40,000 for many times more broadcasts.

The other outstanding symphony orchestras of the country, those of Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, San Francisco, Cleveland, Detroit, Cincinnati, Minneapolis and Los Angeles, have had varied financial experiences during the depression, but all have survived intact. Some of them, as in Boston and Chicago, have maintained relatively small deficits, others, like the Philadelphia orchestra, were able to obtain broadcasting under advertisers' sponsorship, though Stokowski's fifteen-minute snatches made small appeal to music lovers. But attendance has necessarily declined at all of them, and though last season saw a slight improvement, audiences are probably still some 30 percent below those of 1929. And everyone, conductors, soloists, orchestra men and stagehands, have suffered cuts, often drastic ones.

One answer to the situation, obviously, is federal subsidy. As a nation do we care enough about good music to support it? The technical problems of management could be worked out. With radio there is a genuine warrant for support from the federal government for a few of the great symphony orchestras of the country. Already such support is being given to smaller orchestras, but, in our typical way, not as support to music but as support to the unemployed. Orchestras such as that of Syracuse, New York, and the North Carolina Symphony have been organized in various parts of the country and supported by relief funds. It is an excellent idea, but there is no advantage in subsidizing music indirectly. Unemployment relief and the support of music are both proper, but separate, objectives. We presume that we are a nation mature enough to value music for its own sake.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1934, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Facts About Faces: I. *Roger Baldwin*

Smooth egg forehead with two small finely incised wrinkles and a troubled pucker in the middle. Vaguely furred brows hovering over small, deepset, eager eyes, a straight earnest nose and a tense distressed mouth with wincing wiggles in it. Dusty hair, a bit bedraggled. Turn-out clean but careless. Manner tumblingly hurried. Joviality a bit forced, a brave drop-curtain between you and a sensitive nature, thin-skinned, quiveringly without a carapace. Personality generous, self-disciplined, aristocratic, Galahadian, full of fervor and violent integrity, emotional, ethical, tirelessly seeking the Grail. A genuine article.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

End of the Conquistadores

AFTER years of exile and imprisonment, Raul Haya de la Torre, leader of the Aprista movement in Peru, seems about to take power. Apparently the premature Aprista uprising in the southern area around Cuzco, a few days ago, has been put down, but most observers believe the collapse of the present regime, based on the Spanish-blood landowners and the Roman Catholic Church, is a matter of months at most.

Haya ought to be better known in the United States. Still under forty, he is the most portentous South American alive. South American intellectuals speak of him with that misty reverence reserved in this country for Abraham Lincoln. He is to be the *liberador* of a continent. Perhaps so. But what does seem certain is that just as the Madero-Carranza-Obregón-Calles revolution has definitely brought about the end of the white man's influence and prestige in Mexico (which is the essential political statement in Diego Rivera's Mexico City murals), so an Aprista victory in Peru would end white domination, not only in Peru but along a large part of the South American west coast.

Haya has been occasionally compared to Francisco I. Madero, the mild, cultured, liberal little leader of the Mexican uprising against Díaz. Both represent the intellectual, professional middle class in opposition to the Spanish-blood landowners. There are at least two differences, however, between the men. Madero's aims were primarily political. He wanted to break up the feudal haciendas and return the land to the Indian farm workers, but much more he wanted to obtain "effective suffrage" (Madero's battle cry) and the prohibition of re-election to office. The objectives of Haya are first of all economic. He announces that A.P.R.A. (the initial letters of Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana) has but a single purpose: to raise the mass standard of living, or, as he says, "give a pair of shoes to every Indian."

The second difference between them is that Madero, with his egalitarian ideas, made no distinction between whites and Indians. It was not until after Madero's death and the coming to leadership of Obregón and Calles, that the Mexican revolution acquired its pro-Indian bias. The Aprista movement, on the other hand, has been pro-Indian from its inception.

The ancestry of Haya's theories is fairly clear. As a schoolboy, he studied under a remarkable old Peruvian named Gonzales Parada, who had the same faith in the wonders of liberal democracy possessed by Madero in Mexico. But while Haya was still in school, the World War came along, and after 1917, in Latin America as everywhere else in the world, the Russian Revolution suddenly supplanted the French Revolution as a basis for intellectual theorizing. Then Haya, not long afterwards, was sentenced to exile by the Peruvian dictator, Leguía. He wandered through Mexico and Cuba, paid a brief visit to Columbia University in New York City and ended up in England. There he attended Ruskin College, Oxford, and the London School of Economics. In the British Labor Party of Beatrice and Sidney Webb, Philip Snowden and Ramsey Macdonald, Haya found a pseudo-reconciliation of the liberal democracy he had imbibed from Gonzales Parada and the Marxian class struggle of which the world was now full. Bizarre as it may seem, British Fabianism is the true mother of the South American A.P.R.A.

While he was in London, Haya made a quick trip to Russia. He couldn't speak Russian, but he succeeded in learning the "Internationale," verses and chorus complete, phonetically—syllable by syllable. Haya is a big, burly, all-pervading sort of person, and once back in England he persisted in breaking up whatever gathering he was in, forcing everyone to stand up and sing the "Internationale," in Russian, at his direction. But Haya had not been happy in the U.S.S.R. He had found no place for middle-class intellectuals like himself. He greatly preferred England.

During his English period, Haya was soft. But he went back to Peru four years ago, and made a tumultuous campaign for the presidency, to which he was unquestionably legally elected, but was thrust into prison by his opponent, Sanchez Cerro, an army chieftain who had previously overthrown Leguía. For sixteen months, Haya lay in jail, each dawn expecting to be stood up against a wall and shot. That experience made him, emotionally, as tough as steel. Intellectually, however, he didn't change. He still believes, something like Mr. Roosevelt, in "good" and "bad" capitalists. The Spanish-blood landowners in the mountain valleys, whose family ownership runs back a full four hundred years, are "bad." Their estates are to be straightway confiscated and handed back to the Peruvian Indian village councils. But the proprietors of Peru's rapidly multiplying industrial establishments, mostly rich *cholos* and non-Spanish immigrants, are "good." Provided they observe British Labor Party standards of wages, hours and working conditions, they will be left in peace. Further investments of American capital in Peru's mines, railways and hydro-electric power plants are to be cordially encouraged. One of Haya's warmest admirers is United States Ambassador Deering. Last January Secretary of State Hull passed by Lima on his way home from the Montevideo Con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ference, and Mr. Deering brought Haya, then in hiding from the Peruvian police, to shake hands with him.

What makes Haya a great figure is not his somewhat tepid program, but the fact that he has brought to South America from Europe the technique of modern mass movements. The organization of A.P.R.A. approaches in form that of the Russian Communist Party; its cohesiveness is much greater than that of the Italian Fascisti or the German Nazis in their early periods. A.P.R.A. has had an extraordinarily high-grade propaganda division under the girl poet, Magda Portal. In each Peruvian city there are supposed to be disguised party cafeterias, party bookstores, party adult night schools. Every business house, every department of the government, is supposed to have its party cell, and attempts are being made to form cells in each army regiment. Aprista groups exist in the country among the Indians on many estates, usually formed around a secret Aprista school. Along with all this has gone solid British Fabian research into every aspect of Peruvian life. It is said that an anticipatory Aprista government has been already selected, with revolutionary decrees written out and waiting in the members' portfolios.

The significant thing about the Aprista movement, however, is its racial twist. The Spanish never came to the South American west coast as settlers, as the English and Dutch came to what is now the United States. They came as conquerors and administrators, with the single object of extracting as much loot as possible and carting it back to Spain. Spain eventually fell into decay, and rich Peruvian Spaniards now go to Paris instead of Madrid, but the essence of the system remains as it was in the early 1500's.

Set in a sea of potentially hostile natives, the Spaniards long ago adopted the same methods of defending their group integrity that, for example, you find now among the English in India. The white man may have native mistresses, but he must not marry one of them. In business and politics, the white man meets half-breeds and natives on terms of friendly equality, but the half-breed or native cannot enter his home or social club. By thus eschewing entangling emotional alliances, the white group is enabled to act always as a unit in defense of its own interests. In the case of the British in India these interests have centered around the government Treasury and the army; in Peru they concern the great, semi-autonomous landed estates.

In Peru over the course of four centuries, this system has produced a large number of half-breeds and declassed Spaniards, some of them rich and many of them occupants of governmental office. These persons feel their hopes of achievement and happiness unrealizable, while this Skull-and-Bones, college secret society of whites sits in the center of things. From them comes the driving force behind the Aprista movement. There was almost exactly the same racial set-up, you will recall, in pre-revolutionary Mexico. Generals Obregón and Calles triumphed not because of the militancy of the Indian peons, but by the refusal of the non-aristocratic intellectuals any longer to defend the regime. The Mexican revolution's one definite result has been that all the noble Don Fulano de Tals, tracing their blood to the conquistadores, have been run out of Mexico for keeps.

The pro-Indian character of both the Mexican revolution and of A.P.R.A. is partly phoney. Both represent a new, emerging *mestizo* and declassed white group rather than exploited Indian farm workers. The Aztecs and Montezuma have not been restored to dominance in Mexico, nor will Atahualpa, son of the Great Inca, be brought back in Peru. Nevertheless, this cult of the Indian expresses a necessary, important moral shift. As long as the Spaniard and things Spanish were alone officially honorable, and the word "Indian" a term of dishonor, the effect was spiritually to disinherit the great majority of people, even those with only a slight admixture of Indian blood. By definition, they were inferior, and as inferiors they were licked. Diego Rivera's murals and the current frenzied archeological research of the Mexican government in Yucatan and elsewhere are instinctive attempts to give the mass of Mexican people some sort of emotional rock to stand on.

Some time ago, this correspondent saw Haya in his Lima hiding place. He spoke of "us descendants of the Incas . . .," meaning the Apristas. This despite the fact that Haya himself, according to his followers, is of purest Spanish blood. But the landed Spanish aristocrats were Haya's enemies, and he had cut himself off from them. Only by inflating the Inca tradition and identifying himself with it, was he able to feel strong and contemptuous towards the Spanish "foreigners," and to fight them. An incident showed how completely Haya had made himself feel Indian. This correspondent happened to mention Mexico, and at once Haya broke out with tribal patriotism like a rash. The Aztecs of Mexico, it quickly developed, were a crude, rude, warlike lot, not comparable to the civilized Peruvian Quichuas. The Incas were greater than the Egyptians, far greater than the Greeks, and the possessors of perhaps the most splendid of major world cultures.

In Peru this bestowal of social honorableness upon the Indian with the equivalent debasement of white prestige, has immediate, dangerous international implications. The old Inca Empire, in addition to Peru, included southern Ecuador, most of Bolivia and northern Chile. The moment Haya takes power in Peru, there are likely to be parallel revolts against the Spanish landowners throughout this area. In Ecuador, where the whites are outnumbered ten to one by non-whites, the *mestizo* element is already very strong. In Bolivia, in the course of the Chaco war, the whites have made the capital mistake of teaching the Indians how

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to operate machine guns. There have been recurrent revolts among Indian regiments. Some experienced, sober-minded observers believe that an Aprista victory at Lima might conceivably touch off a savage massacre of white Spaniards at La Paz. At present, Chile is split in two halves: the sulky, rebellious Indian *rotos* (the "broken ones," in the bleak, honest Spanish word) of the north, and the apprehensive, blustering whites of the south. The whites have organized themselves into two heavily armed private armies, the Milicia Republicana, or "army in overalls," and the Nazis, composed partly of German immigrants and reputedly under supervision from Berlin. If Haya's taking power at Lima were to precipitate an Indian uprising which extended to the *rotos* of Chile, there would be serious danger that these two irresponsible fascist white armies might invade Peru. This is an eventuality about which we in the United States should be forewarned. To the degree that the United States can have influence in the situation, it should be on the side of Haya and such social freedom as he represents.

The closely articulated, solid organization of A.P.R.A., on a continent where mass organization is utterly unknown, makes Haya's triumph almost certain. An A.P.R.A. government will at least mean that small boys and girls in Peru will no longer need to grow up in the unhappy conviction that a white skin is something to be feared, honored and obeyed. The intrinsic superiority of European ancestry, customs and religion is being challenged over a great area. Far from this being a white man's hemisphere, over nearly one-third its extent the Indian seems likely to become once again culturally dominant. JONATHAN MITCHELL.

Security for Americans

VI: *A Program for Old-Age Security*

THE DEMAND in this country for social provision for the dependent aged has at last reached the stage of agitation and public ferment witnessed in Great Britain more than twenty-six years ago. But there is a distinction. The masses in Great Britain, aware of their strength, followed a leadership that was both socially minded and realistic. In the United States utter desperation has driven the masses of the aged to grasp at phantom utopias dangled by a leadership composed largely of racketeers and demagogues, who, in exploiting the misery of these aged, are piling up fortunes for themselves. While Herbert Asquith, British Prime Minister at the time, had a clear conception of the practical issues involved, and while no one had his ears attuned to the popular will and understood better what was politically wise than Lloyd George, his Chancellor of the Exchequer, the leadership of even our well intentioned politicians and statesmen has been characterized by confusion as well as by an inability to appreciate the greatly increased demand for immediate social protection in old age.

The student of this problem in the United States is impressed at once with the fact that no nation was ever confronted with so great an accumulated problem of old-age dependency as this country has faced during the past few decades. This is due to a number of reasons:

1. While other nations have been making social provisions for their aged for nearly a half-century, we have stubbornly refused, despite our stupendous industrial expansion, ever to consider any action until the last decade.

2. We have neglected this problem despite the fact that side by side with our industrial development our population has been growing steadily older—the average span of life has risen 50 percent in less than a century—resulting in an increase in the number of our aged from approximately one million in 1870 to nearly seven millions in 1930.

3. Although the tragic irony of our industrial civilization in decreasing the years of remunerative employment while lengthening the period of old age has been evident in every country for many years, this has been especially acute in the United States. In no country has specialization in industry become so universal. No nation finds so little need of skill and experience—the older worker's only assets—as the United States. As a result of the widespread development of company-welfare plans, an employment deadline at forty and even thirty-five years has become a well established practice in many of our industries, to an extent entirely unknown abroad. A study by the National Association of Manufacturers in 1929 revealed that 30 percent of the concerns investigated—mainly the large corporations—openly admitted the adoption of definite age limits ranging all the way from twenty-five to seventy, with the most frequent limit set at forty-five years for unskilled and semi-skilled workers, and fifty years for skilled workers. The decreasing employment opportunities for the aged are also shown by the 1930 Census. Whereas no less than 90.5 percent of all males between the ages of sixteen and sixty-four were gainfully employed in 1930, only 58.3 percent of those who had passed their sixty-fifth year were so employed.

4. There is an increasing difficulty in providing for the declining years of life. Wage scales are so low that saving is a practical impossibility for the wage worker. Besides, his savings are easily swallowed up by sickness, accidents and unemployment. Moreover, many of those

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who managed to lay something aside have lost their savings in bad investments or bank failures.

5. The most ancient method of old-age security—support by children—has practically disappeared in the United States. The family unit is smaller and more disintegrated here than in other countries. Dependence upon children and relatives who are either scattered or barely able to eke out their own existence is most precarious, and the city apartment is hardly equipped to accommodate an extra father or grandfather.

It is but natural that these difficulties should have become aggravated during the depression. With curtailed operation and a limitless supply of all kinds of labor, the chances of an aged person's finding a job have almost completely vanished. A Philadelphia survey made in April, 1931, when the depression was still young, covering 67,150 employable workers, already showed that 34.4 percent of those sixty-six years of age and over were totally unemployed, as contrasted with 22.9 percent among workers twenty-six to fifty-five years of age. Furthermore, while the younger groups of workers had been unemployed an average of 36.2 weeks, the older workers had been out of jobs for nearly twice as long. A similar study in Buffalo in November of that year showed 67 percent of the unemployed between sixty-five and seventy years had already been without work for more than a year.

The above difficulties have not been confined to manual workers. Professional and technical men as well as a great many farmers are faced with the same difficulties and can no longer expect to support themselves for as long a period as their fathers and grandfathers did.

These accumulated and neglected problems have brought about a situation that warrants the estimate, on the basis of the most careful studies, that approximately 2,700,000 of the 6,634,000 persons sixty-five years of age and over in the United States in 1930 were supported wholly or partly by others. The number of these aged dependents was approximately two and a half times the total number of aged in the United States sixty-five years ago, and has obviously increased considerably during the past few years.

The colossal nature of the problem and the downright failure to cope with it effectively must be kept uppermost in mind in any discussion of the American problem of old-age security. Forty-five years ago, when large-scale industry was everywhere still in its swaddling clothes, it was possible for Germany to confine its social provisions for the aged, enacted in 1889, to a system of contributory insurance that would not mature for some time to come. Only two years later, however, in 1891, Denmark found it imperative to adopt a system of non-contributory old-age pensions to be paid on the basis of need. The beginning of the twentieth century found the problem of old-age dependency in

CONTRIBUTORY OLD-AGE-PENSION PLANS

Country and Year of Original Law		*Classes Covered*	*Pensionable Age*	*Contributors*[1]	*Number Covered*
Austria	1926	Salaried employees	Men, 65—Women, 60	W. E.	212,000
	1927	Wage earners	65	W. E. S.	Not operating
	1928	Agricultural workers	65	W. E. S.	Not operating
Belgium	1924	Wage earners	Men, 65—Women, 60	W. E. S.	No figures available
	1925	Salaried employees	Men, 65—Women, 60	W. E.	No figures available
Brazil	1923	Public-utility workers	No age specified	W. E.	140,435
Bulgaria	1924	All workers	60	W. E. S.	220,000
Chile	1925	Salaried employees	50	W. E.	80,220
	1925	Wage earners	55	W. E. S.	1,203,500
Cuba	1921	Transportation workers	No age specified	W. E.	101,000
Czechoslovakia	1924	Wage earners	65	W. E. S.	2,100,000
	1929	Salaried employees	Men, 65—Women, 60	W. E.	360,000
France	1928	All workers	60	W. E. S.	4,000,000
Germany	1889	Wage earners	65	W. E. S.	18,000,000
	1911	Salaried employees	65	W. E.	3,500,000
Great Britain	1925	All workers	65	W. E. S.	17,263,000
Greece	1923	All workers	Men, 65—Women, 60	W. E.	No figures available
Hungary	1928	All workers	65	W. E. S.	630,000
Iceland	1909	All workers	60	W. S.	No figures available
Italy	1919	All workers	65	W. E. S.	5,500,000
Lithuania	1922	All workers in Memel	No age specified	W. E.	25,000
Luxemburg	1911	All workers	65	W. E. S.	50,000
Netherlands	1913	All workers	65	E. S.	2,550,000
Northern Ireland	1925	All workers	65	W. E. S.	350,000
Poland	1911	All workers in former German territory	No age specified	W. E. S.	926,000
	1927	Salaried employees	65	W. E.	225,081
Portugal	1919	All workers	70	W. E. S.	2,000,000
Rumania	1912	All workers	65	W. E. S.	620,000
Soviet Union	1921	All workers	Men, 60—Women, 55	E.	No figures available
Spain	1919	All workers	60	E. S.	4,000,000
Sweden	1913	All citizens over 16 years of age	67	W. S.	3,728,000
Switzerland (3 cantons)		All persons between stated ages	65	W. S.	No figures available
Uruguay	1919	All workers	60	E. S.	No figures available

[1] W.=Workers, E.=Employers, S.=State.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most industrial nations too pressing to wait for a contributory system to become effective. Thus France in 1905, and England in 1908, were forced to enact non-contributory pension systems to meet the immediate needs of their aged. Only years after they made provision for those who had already attained old age did these two countries inaugurate contributory plans to meet the future needs of the aged and to ease the burden upon the government.

This most basic and elemental fact—the immediate need of social protection for the destitute aged—although not yet generally understood is obviously our most pressing problem. What we need today is, first of all, a device to meet the problem of the accumulated dependency in old age. As in the case of the unemployed today, some system must be provided immediately to take care of those in want. Everyone agrees that the three-century-old system of outdoor and indoor relief for these aged poor has proved ineffective, costly and degrading. On the other hand, systems of old-age pensions or assistance now on the statute books in twenty-eight states do offer today the only available self-respecting and economical method of providing for these aged. Unfortunately, it is into the solution of this immediate problem that so much confusion and misunderstanding have been infused. Taught by the insurance companies to look with awe upon the insurance principle, and reluctant to assume the public burden, the American public mind immediately turns to insurance plans for contributions by the workers for their own old-age protection, and refuses to see the fact that there is no possible way of collecting contributions from men and women who have no jobs and therefore no means of paying.

This confusion was best illustrated by the statement of Franklin D. Roosevelt who, as Governor of New York, had fought more valiantly for the enactment of an old-age-security act than any other Governor at the time. Hardly had he signed the New York Old Age Security Act in 1930—which has since been providing for approximately 53,000 old men and women in that state—when in a legislative message in January, 1931, Governor Roosevelt declared, "I have many times stated that I am not satisfied with the provisions of this law. Its present form, although objectionable as providing for a gratuity, may be justified only as a means intended to replace to a large extent the existing methods of poorhouse and poor-farm relief. Any great enlargement of the theory of this law could, however, smack of the practices of a dole. Our American aged do not want charity, but rather old-age comforts to which they are rightfully entitled by their own thrift and foresight in the form of insurance." Ever since that statement, it has been almost impossible to discuss the issue in a realistic manner. No sooner is a member of Congress or a state legislator converted to the necessity of providing for the aged than he begins to argue that what we need is the immediate inauguration of a contributory insurance plan.

Actually, an insurance system can apply only to younger groups of persons who while at work make periodic contributions over a long period of years. Those who are completely destitute and without hope of ever finding a job obviously cannot be expected to make any contribution to a pension scheme. They must be taken care of somehow and non-contributory pensions offer the only humane and economical method of helping them.

Some hope of clarifying national thinking on the subject can now be looked for from Washington. Fortunately, the old-age-pension experts of the President's Committee on Economic Security see the problem clearly, and reports in the press indicate that they are presenting a constructive program, comprising: (1) a plan for federal subsidies to the states with adequate pension systems; (2) a contributory plan to cover younger gainfully employed persons who could thus be assured of old-age security through a system of contributory insurance.

Such a program offers the only realistic approach to the problem of old-age dependency. There is,

NON-CONTRIBUTORY OLD-AGE-PENSION PLANS

(Functioning at government expense)

Country and Year of Original Law		*Pensionable Age*	*Maximum Income Allowed for Pension Eligibility*	*Maximum Pension per Year*	*Number of Pensioners*
Australia	1908	Men, 65—Women, 60	$390 [1]	$227.50 [1]	183,317
Canada, except Quebec and New Brunswick	1927	70	$365	$240	66,000
Denmark	1891	65	Varies according to need	Varies	124,000
Great Britain	1908	70	$250	$130	850,000
Greenland	1926	55	No limits set (Paid only to Eskimos—whites excluded)	No maximum	500
Guernsey, Isle of	1926	70	$200	$104	500
Irish Free State	1908	70	$196.25	$130	112,131
Newfoundland	1911	75	No limits set	$50	3,000
New Zealand	1898	Men, 65—Women, 60	$400	$205	29,000
Northern Ireland	1908	70	$250	$130	43,119
South Africa, Union of	1928	65	$270	$150	52,718

[1] These figures have been translated into United States currency, using $5 as the exchange rate of the pound sterling; on December 22, 1934, the pound was quoted at $4.94⅝.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moreover, considerable hope that it will really constitute the congressional program in 1935. Committees in two successive Congresses have already unanimously recommended the Dill-Connery Bill, which aims to set up a federal subsidy to states with adequate and uniform pensions laws. This bill would have been enacted by Congress last spring had not President Roosevelt promised a wider program of social insurance for "next winter." With administration support, this bill may definitely be expected to pass in 1935.

At best, of course, the old-age-pension method is not a one-hundred-percent solution of the problem. A plan of this nature must of necessity be restricted to need, but there is no way of meeting the present problem except on such a governmental basis. With a federal subsidy, the present old-age-security laws can be made more self-respecting and adequate enough to eliminate destitution and to protect our aged against dependency. The subsidy can be made contingent upon definite requirements that will not only raise the present standards and facilitate the lowering of the age limit—which is still set at seventy in the most important states—but will also induce many new states to enact such laws. It will also enable the federal government to obtain an adequate and more or less uniform administration, thus making the law practically national in scope. Demands for universal straight grants of large sums of money without any test of need, which have become widespread in the United States, were not unknown abroad years ago, but no nation has ever attempted such a thing nor can we afford to undertake it. From a social point of view, it is also, of course, unnecessary to do this, since our immediate task is to prevent destitution and to establish a guarantee that the state will cope with it. There is as yet no need to worry about the fate of such aged persons as John D. Rockefeller or the retiring of Mr. Atterbury of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

The contributory plan of social insurance can only be considered in terms of the future problem of old-age dependency. Because of the confusion that exists in the public mind it would be inadvisable to propose the two systems in one bill. Preferably, we should adopt first a bill to strengthen and improve the existing old-age-pension laws, along the lines of the Dill-Connery Bill. The immediate problem of the aged thus solved, Congress should not postpone for a moment the inauguration of an actuarially sound contributory-insurance plan, with contributions beginning as soon as possible. Tripartite contributions—from the employer, the worker and the state and federal governments—offer the most equitable and logical way of meeting the costs of a contributory scheme. This system is now used in many countries and has been found successful everywhere.

After a contributory plan has been in operation five or ten years it will be possible to provide that contributors who arrive at the pensionable age can retire on a pension from the insurance fund. Insured persons would then be disqualified from the non-contributory plan, and, as their number increases with the years, the burden on the states and the federal government will gradually be decreased. The sooner the contributory plan is instituted, of course, the sooner this can be achieved.

Coördination between the two systems can be made by exempting all persons having an income of more than a specified sum from the non-contributory schemes. This would mean that as soon as an insured person is able to build up enough resources in his own fund, he would automatically be disqualified from receiving the non-contributory pension. Since the contributory plan cannot possibly embrace every person, protection for those not so covered would continue to be afforded by the non-contributory system. The twofold pension plan will thus remove for all time the dread of a destitute old age and the poorhouse that now confronts the majority of the workers in the United States.

ABRAHAM EPSTEIN.

The next and final article in this series will be a broad consideration of the problem of economic security by George Soule.—THE EDITORS.

On with the Dance

(Vienna, June, '34)

Under the lamp-strung chestnut-trees, the sweet budding
limes,
Among the yelling switchbacks and the Kinos,
The cool, crowded beer gardens, where music pours,
Stifled news and rumors, like shadows, flitter.

"Last night the Reds in our district . . ."
"Did you hear the bombs explode by the gasworks? . . ."
"They say the Browns have all escaped . . . "

Three sailors, arm in arm, lurch down the alley,
Their words fall darkly among the jokes of love—
"Both railway lines were blown to pieces,
"Yet the trains were warned . . ." And here, pack-
saddled,
A party of trippers returning from the river
Mix with their friends beside the shooting booths—
"He told me"—the shadows fly—"Only last week
"One struck the other at a Cabinet meeting . . ."
"Were those our own troops in the lorries, or . . ."
"I've certain news they've settled that swine's hash,
"They found him, stabbed, in the woods."—
A group of boys by a restaurant trellis
Mutter together between cigarettes.

And from the papers sold before the tram
And over the radio from hour to hour,
Monotonous, important, insincere,
The voices of the rulers come—
"All's well, all's orderly, on with the dance!"

JOHN LEHMANN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Old Guard Never Surrenders

IT WAS my remark about the "Morro Castle" disaster that threw the fat in the fire.

Huddersfield, of Huddersfield, Brown and Company, was reputed as rich as Croesus, and when at the president's reception Mrs. Huddersfield, mistaking me for goodness knows whom, had invited me to dinner I had accepted with alacrity but also with misgivings.

Nor had my misgivings proved to be without foundation, for while the food and drinks repaid even the wretched hour on the unsavory Elevated that crawls from Chicago to the comfortable northern suburbs, the conversation had been trying. I had managed to hold my peace, however, until we were seated after dinner, highballs in hand, before the cheerful fire in the drawing room.

The talk had been upon Mr. Hoover's new book, which all agreed was sound and salutary, but it was feared that even this clarion blast on Truth's trumpet would do little good.

"The thing's gone too far for mere talking or writing," a retired stockbroker by the name of Haight had observed. He was regarded with great respect by the others and his utterances accepted as oracular, for he had liquidated just before the crash. What we needed, he had further affirmed, was action, vigorous action, against the "Reds" and communists. To temporize spelled ruin, for they were numerous, subtle, vicious and unscrupulous.

"Look at the 'Morro Castle' affair," he had insisted. "That shows you what they'll do! They neglect their duty and when reprimanded burn a whole ship, filled with women and children, in revenge!"

"Isn't it terrible!" Mrs. Huddersfield said.

The second highball had given me courage or had taken away my horse-sense, I don't know which.

"There is no proof," I blurted, "that the ship was deliberately set on fire, and there is certainly no proof that the radio operator, for I assume that it is to him that you are referring, had a hand in it. In fact, he seems to have been one of the very few men on the ship who tried to do his duty.

"What was really wrong with the 'Morro Castle,'" I continued, taking advantage of the silence caused by my first remark, "was that there was a lack of the very regimentation that Mr. Hoover so deplores. The crew contained too many rugged individualists who refused to subordinate their personal desires to the needs of that particular social group. Competition for the lifeboats was unregulated, and naturally the crew won out."

Since such a remark could be construed as a reflection on most of the company present, the host felt it incumbent upon himself to deal with me. His rebuke was swift and terrible.

"Young man," he asked gravely, "what do you teach?"

The answer, "English," dissolved the whole suspended cloud of indignation. I need obviously not be taken seriously. Some of the frowns relaxed to smiles of half-contemptuous amusement, and Mrs. Haight whispered something to her neighbor, Mrs. Borsch, the wife of the semi-renowned gynecologist who sat next to the fire silently enjoying his cigar.

"Well," grunted Haight, who did not seem particularly mollified at this revelation of the insignificance of his antagonist, "you've got a lot to learn!"

He turned in his chair to face me directly and emphasized his remark by poking the air with his cigarette. "You think we're entering utopia, you liberals, while the fact is that we are living in a reign of terror at this very moment!"

In the darker back portion of the room the butler set down a tray of new drinks with a soft tinkle. It seemed a very cosy reign of terror.

"How do you mean?" I asked.

"Take the collection of the income tax." His face expressed a brooding sense of wrong. "Roosevelt—"

"Public Enemy Number One," corrected Dr. Borsch from beside the fire, with a chuckle.

There was a general laugh; Borsch was famous as a wit.

"Roosevelt," Haight went on, disregarding but not displeased with the interruption, "has given special secret orders that they are to stop at nothing —perjury, terrorism of any kind—to compel people to pay income tax that is not due. If they can get hold of any poor fellow who doesn't know his legal rights, they have him up before a Star Chamber and scare him with threats of prison until he either pays money he shouldn't or slips them hush-money. It's pure blackmail, and it's done at the express order of the government!"

Seeing that I was not convinced, he added angrily, "I had that personally from a special investigator. He told me those were his instructions."

I remembered that in my own unimportant case the income-tax man had pointed out one or two minor exemptions to which I did not know that I was entitled and had suggested that I rewrite my report, but Haight's last remark had shifted the whole discussion to a purely personal basis. As the belligerency of his bearing said plainly that any further questioning of the facts would be regarded as a reflection upon his veracity, I merely muttered that it seemed a dangerous thing for any government to do.

"They have to," explained Huddersfield. "They've so accustomed the people to receiving money for nothing that they daren't stop now.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They've got to have more and more money to give away. God knows where it will end!"

"We are on the eve of a revolution," said Dr. Borsch in a solemn voice. "I look to see it break before the winter's over."

Every face grew sober and all voices dropped a note.

"We have more than a hundred dollars' worth of canned goods stored in the cellar," said Mrs. Huddersfield in a dramatic half-whisper.

I glanced sideways to note the repressed smiles, but found none. Instead there was the deepest concern and approval. It semed, from further talk, that they all had canned goods in the cellar. The coming revolution was no jest. Troops were being secretly massed, militias armed and trusted Republicans quietly placed in all strategic positions, though how this last was being accomplished under the noses of Democratic federal and state governments was not made quite clear.

"Roosevelt's on his last legs," affirmed Haight. "He's done for! The very craziness of some of his latest schemes shows that! Look at that idea of belts of trees, each one a hundred miles through, stretching the entire length of the country! He's haywire. Even the common people are beginning to suspect that now!"

"They say if that fails," interposed Dr. Borsch, slyly, "that they're going to cut holes, a hundred miles wide, through the Rockies to let the trade winds through."

"Even if it were possible," continued Haight, when the laughter had subsided, "which it isn't, it would do no good. Trees won't grow in most of the soil out there; there's too much iodine or something in it."

"Too much iodine in the soil's what causes cancer, isn't it?" asked Mrs. Huddersfield, brightly. She had hitherto taken but a minor part in the discussion, but once engaged she was not to be discouraged even by the emphatic "No" which her husband returned to her query.

"I think you're all too hard on Roosevelt," she protested. "He certainly has great personal magnitude, and while he may be misled, I'm sure he means well!"

Mrs. Huddersfield's father had voted for Cleveland and so, as a concession to filial piety, she was permitted a little political heterodoxy, but this was obviously too much.

"What's he done," jeered Haight, "to show he means well?"

"Well," she answered valiantly, "there's at least some things he *hasn't* done. I know you don't believe the story, Charlie"—directing a misunderstood-woman expression at her husband—"but you know we had it on good authority that the first thing Roosevelt did, the very day he took office, was to forbid the sailing of Morgan's yacht because Hoover and Morgan were planning to get away with the gold from the Federal Reserve bank. Hoover knew the banks were going to close and he'd had it taken out the week before. They were afraid to send them to jail, but hushed the whole thing up because it would have caused an awful panic!"

"Hoover might as well have taken the gold as have left it for Roosevelt and his brain-trusters to confiscate and spend," grunted Huddersfield.

I trembled for Roosevelt, lest Mrs. Huddersfield come directly to his support, and stepped quickly into the breach.

"Surely," I pleaded, "he has done something for the unemployed and the drought-stricken farmers. And experts seem to agree that reforestation on a large scale is necessary and will in time more than pay for itself."

"Isn't it dreadful," sighed Mrs. Huddersfield as she relapsed into obscurity, "that all this unemployment should have come just at the time of the depression!"

"Why should he do anything for the farmers," demanded Haight, challengingly. "They went out there to try to make fortunes out of wheat. For a while they succeeded. Now they've failed. They were speculators and they lost! Why should the business man in the East be taxed to make good *their* losses? They weren't taxed to cover *our* losses!"

This view of the farm problem seen through the eyes of a retired stockbroker was too original for me to have a ready answer for it, and even if I had, it would have done no good, for he again put the whole argument on a personal basis.

"I know for a fact," he added, "that out in Dakota the federal-relief people are giving a wagonload of wheat a day to every farmer who comes for it, and right before their eyes the farmers drive across the street and sell it to the grain elevator!"

"Pretty soft for them," said Huddersfield. "I wish somebody'd do that for me in my business."

"*Soft* is right," snorted Haight. "Naturally they don't work any more. Why should they? Santa Claus'll keep 'em—as long as *our* money lasts!"

"There may be some instances of the abuse of relief," I parried weakly, "but surely, on the whole, the extension of social protection is a good thing. We need more of it, if anything."

"What do you mean?" asked Huddersfield.

"Oh, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, maternity benefits. We're sadly behind most other civilized countries in these things. In the field of public health alone there's so much to be done!"

Too late it flashed through my mind that Dr. Borsch had been one of the fiercest opponents of the newly established municipal free clinic. He, however, continued quietly sucking his cigar while, to my woe, the attack came from his wife, a plump, dark, energetic little woman of about forty.

"Entirely too much of that sort of thing is being done as it is," she said sharply, "and it does the people as much harm as good."

"Not only are they being deprived of all initiative," she went on, "but serious physical harm is

LICENSED TO OCLC-GGC
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

done them by all this free health work. Before professional busybodies found it such a paying job to be concerned about them they used to develop immunities, but now they have been protected so much that they have no resistance to disease!"

Her tone was exasperating. "Let 'em develop immunities," I suggested, "if a surfeit of cake has lowered their resistance."

This was apparently bad taste. Mrs. Borsch might be able to fight like an amazon, but she demanded the privileges and exemptions of a lady. The whole company became awkwardly silent.

"It's not as funny," she said icily, "as you choose to think."

I tried to look abject, but there was to be no quarter. Her color had risen above her rouge and the sharp staccato of her manicured nails on the arm of her chair was ominous.

"Half-baked philanthropists usually do more harm than good," she said with a sneer. "A neighbor of mine, for instance, a Mrs. Fontenoy, who lives not two blocks from our home, has just adopted two children whose parents died of tuberculosis last year.

"She *thinks* she's doing a world of good, and no doubt is *very* proud of herself, but she doesn't stop to consider—"

She leaned forward and glared directly at me as she heightened her voice to drive home this illustration of the perniciousness of unconsidered charity.

"She doesn't stop to consider that while she is possibly helping *two* children, she is endangering the lives of twenty others with whom they will play by introducing into their society children who are probably tubercular.

"I for one," she added firmly, relaxing in triumph at the thought that her virtue had not shirked its duty, however unpleasant, "have forbidden *my* children to have anything to do with them. Mrs. Fontenoy may have the consequences of her meddling to herself!"

I thought it a great pity that she should thus deprive her children of so splendid an opportunity to develop an immunity, but silence seemed the better part of valor.

The whole company was a bit uneasy and there were several jocular attempts to smooth things over. A new round of highballs was urged, and Mrs. Huddersfield hopefully suggested that Amos 'n' Andy would soon be on. But even the imminence of such bliss could not undo the damage. I had "displac'd the mirth, and broke the good meeting with admir'd disorder."

The Borsches soon excused themselves and left. We all bowed and smiled and shook hands. The doctor was cordial, but Mrs. Borsch could not refrain from making a parthian shot.

"You professors," she said in a voice of acidic kindness, as she worked her fingers into her glove, "ought to think things through a little more."

BERGEN EVANS.

Washington Notes

Roosevelt's Budget Message—Does He Know or Won't He Tell?—The Great Balancing Act —Chavez v. Cutting

AS THE day for the convening of the Seventy-fourth Congress approaches, it is interesting to note the anxiety of the conflicting elements here in the Capital as to the character of the presidential budget message, scheduled for delivery in the first week. At this moment there is no reliable information as to whether this very vocal President of ours will treat the nation to another of his celebrated fireside talks before Congress meets. One was promised, but recently the President has seemed to feel that a pre-New Year broadcast of the taking-the-people-into-my-confidence kind would not be so good because it would anticipate his message to Congress and take the cutting edge off those pronouncements. This may be true, but nevertheless I shall be surprised if Mr. Roosevelt lets the holidays go by without some cheering words to "My Friends" about the progress made during 1934 and the lovely outlook for 1935.

It is not likely, however, that in any such broadcast the budgetary recommendations will be revealed. Unless all precedent is to be disregarded, they will be kept well concealed until officially communicated by the President to Congress. That is one reason, but there is another, even more potent, which is that not until the final moment will the President want the door closed so that he cannot change his mind. He has, as any one must realize, some extremely difficult decisions to make—not only as to details but as to general policy.

At this time no one knows what direction he will take. Within the past two months, he has included in his retinue of advisers quite a few conservative business and financial leaders. From them he is receiving reminders of the budget message of January, 1934, in which he declared his hope that in the fiscal year 1935-36 expenditures could be brought into line with revenues. This statement is now being referred to as a pledge by his conservative advisers and he is being urged to redeem it. Moreover, suggestions as to how it can be redeemed are not wanting. There is, for example, the National Economy League, which lays down for the President's guidance a detailed chart. All he has to do, the League points out, is to cut relief to $1,000,000,000 a year and raise another $900,000,000 in taxes. This seems simple enough, but what it actually means is an almost complete dismantling of practically every New Deal agency, the abandonment of even an emasculated public-works program and the putting of the whole New Deal machinery in reverse.

Other suggestions are being pressed upon the President by which he is told he can balance the budget without additional taxes. They involve the conversion of the Farm Credit Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the R.F.C. into hard-boiled collection agencies from which not a dollar more can be borrowed and which, during the next few years, will concentrate upon collecting (with interest) all the money loaned. I think it is safe to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say that none of these suggestions will be adopted *in toto* by the President. However, I think it equally safe to say that, mindful of his 1934 message and desirous of retaining a reputation for consistency, as well as of keeping the support of the business and financial leaders who have been coöperating with him recently, Mr. Roosevelt in his forthcoming message will speak along what our great metropolitan daily journals love to call "sound financial lines."

In other words, he will reiterate his belief that the time has come for retrenchment and point out the necessity for balancing national expenses with national income. But, for several reasons, he most distinctly will not, I believe, insist that this must be done in any literal sense for the year 1935-36. One reason is that it is obviously impossible. The other is that it means a complete abandonment of the policies upon which he has been proceeding. Certainly, any such insistence upon economy and reduction as is now being urged by his business friends would make monkeys out of members of his Cabinet and others who have been at work for months upon plans involving additional expenditures, all of which have had Mr. Roosevelt's sympathetic interest and support. Above all, of course, it is not going to be possible to cut down relief expenditures, now approximating $2,000,000,000, for the year. On the contrary, the whole present trend is toward a system of work relief instead of straight relief. It is agreed that, while the work-relief project will be infinitely better for the morale of the beneficiaries, it will be much more costly to the government. The net result of all this will be, in my belief, that while the President's recommendations will be along conservative lines, once the message is out of his system and the plaudits of the press have been received, he will continue along the course that has been laid down—largely because there really is no alternative.

In the meantime, the more liberal supporters of Mr. Roosevelt, both political and journalistic, have been growing somewhat alarmed at what they consider the President's tendency to yield to reactionary influences. Some pretty clear warnings are being sounded from the left. Not long ago certain progressive Republican Senators voiced the view that the Democratic Party is fast becoming the conservative party of the country. The extent to which this view will be expressed in Congress depends largely upon how determinedly Mr. Roosevelt puts himself back of the "sound financial recommendations" he is expected to make in his message.

Last week I indicated in this place the belief that the President's opposition to Senator Bronson Cutting during the last campaign and his apparent acquiescence in the movement to contest Senator Cutting's seat had seriously disturbed some of his strongest friends among the progressives. Undoubtedly this was true, and it has caused considerable worry among some of the President's political advisers. Alienation of the progressive group in the Senate is something that, in the view of the better balanced of his counselors, Mr. Roosevelt just cannot afford at this session, despite his popularity and prestige. Hence, I am reliably informed that word has been conveyed to Senate leaders that Mr. Roosevelt is uninterested in the Dennis Chavez contest, that the administration weight will not be behind Mr. Chavez and that Mr. Farley's activities in his behalf, if any, are not endorsed by Mr. Roosevelt. The progressive Senators, however, are entirely aware that Mr. Farley will do nothing that is not approved by his chief, and intend to place responsibility for any Farley activity in this particular matter directly where it belongs. The further purpose is to kick up a thundering row if any real attempt to unseat Mr. Cutting is made. Therefore I think it safe to predict that the Chavez contest will not be pushed.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Regulating Holding Companies—Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde—How to Split the Corporate Atom—Collecting Antiques

THE FEDERAL government is considering the problem of the holding company. Studies are being made looking toward legislation to bring holding companies under regulation. So far as I am concerned this is a little disheartening. The unwillingness of our public men, particularly those in high places, to look the serious problems that vex our economic and social life resolutely in the face is calculated to drain off the last grain of optimism from the most trusting spirit.

If there is anything that is clear in this world it is that the holding company cannot be regulated. Also that no business that comes under the dominion of the holding company can be regulated.

The eternal and baffling commission of government is to govern man. Complex and unpredictable as he may be in his nature, he is yet simple in one thing. The individual man is a unit, an indivisible unit, an identifiable person who can be isolated, recognized, reached by the eye and the hand of the government. In spite of this simplicity he is still hard to govern when he has the will to go astray or when the itch for profit masters him. But suppose he could split himself up, like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Suppose, indeed, he could do better and be Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde at the same time. Better still, suppose he could be Jekyll and Hyde and Smith and Jones and Brown and a dozen other persons at the same instant. Society would be powerless to cope with this multi-personed creature. He could divide a criminal act into a dozen different motions, each one performed by one of his fractional personalities, each act innocent in itself, the crime emerging out of the sum total of the acts of all these monstrous persons. He could put his property in the name of his variously splintered entities, pass it around, shift and shuffle title, moneys, equities, responsibilities, and become so elusive and evasive that no Scotland Yard could lay any of its multitudinous fingers on him.

In New York, I understand, a holding company cannot own ten percent or more of the stock of a utility company without permission of the Public Service Commission. Now it turns out that the Brooklyn Borough Gas Company is owned by the following corporations—the Aden Corporation, the Burma Corporation, the Canton Corporation and the Dover, the Etna, the Farley, the Gorman, the Hector, the Irving, the Java corporations. These are called A B C corporations, and as each one owns a little l... th...

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cent they manage to keep within the law. It would be just as easy to organize a hundred such corporations. It simply amounts to a single corporate entity's splitting itself up into ten entities or as many more as may be necessary to evade the law. And this splitting of corporate personality is nothing more or less than a scheme to make it impossible to govern the corporation.

Why not be realistic about this? Why not recognize that as long as we have the corporation and the holding company and the right of one corporation to hold stock in another corporation, any form of control over the industries affected by such corporate devices is going to be utterly impossible? But of course we will not do this. We will adopt a collection of rules to bring holding companies under regulation and then we will tell the people proudly what we have done about this problem—when we will have done nothing save to complicate it a little more. For as soon as the regulations are made, the corporation lawyers will go to work and enmesh the business in an even more baffling tangle of corporate tricks and we will be worse off than before.

The holding company should be abolished. Of course our noble corporation lawyers and our noble legislators will tell us this is too drastic and that it is impossible. When Senator Glass proposed a bill to put an end to bank-stock affiliates and to give banks two years in which to wind them up, the bankers descended on Washington and said that this would destroy the banks, that five years was the least in which the job could be done. But when the startling revelations about the National City Bank shocked the country, the Chase National, facing investigation, saw the need of swift repentance and cut loose from its affiliate in almost no time at all.

The corporation is a device to enable investors to unite their resources in a common purpose, to enable the management to function as a civil unit and to encourage investment by limiting the liability of the incorporators. To this extent it is a good thing perhaps. But there is no reason under God's heaven why one corporation should be permitted to own stock in another one and above all why a corporation should be permitted to split itself up into a whole congeries of mysterious subsidiary corporations that no one can follow.

I believe that Congress should pass a national incorporation law; that all corporations engaged in interstate commerce should be compelled to take out national charters and that such charters should prohibit the ownership of stock of the corporation by another corporation and should prohibit the corporation from owning stock in another corporation. Also that stock should be issued only for cash or for property subject to rigid appraisal and that there should be one kind of stock and one kind only.

A new book—"Our Lord Birkenhead"—is graced with the following dedicatory sentence. "They also serve who only stand and wait—my creditors." Councillor Clem Norton, of Boston—they call aldermen in Boston councillors—who likes to collect "dedications," calls my attention to a priceless antique. It is found in the vestibule of Professor Alfred Dennis' book, "The Romance of the World." It was written in 1926 and, after the passage of these last

"To my former chief, Herbert Hoover, whose wisdom about the influence which determines the economic relationships of the people who dwell on this planet, transcends the knowledge of all the schools."

This was even before Mr. Hoover had invented the two-car garage and the two-chicken pot.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

On the Labor Front

The Threat of "Proportional Representation"—Half a Look at the Automobile Industry—The Education of White-Collarites

IN A CONFERENCE with William Green, head of the American Federation of Labor, President Roosevelt assured organized labor last week that the administration would provide safeguards for workers in the legislation the next Congress is expected to enact to replace the Recovery Act. Of course, the most important of these safeguards concerns the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively. Will Mr. Roosevelt insist on a bill that will make this right, as expressed in Section 7a, enforceable? On this vital point Mr. Roosevelt has as yet made no specific commitments.

However, his continued support of the idea of proportional representation in the automobile and steel industries is cause for genuine concern. At a White House conference last week, for example, President Roosevelt again attempted to persuade officials of the A.F. of L. to accept a six-month truce in the steel industry. The terms of the truce, proposed by the steel employers themselves, would have given definite recognition to company unions and to proportional representation; in addition, the Steel Labor Relations Board would have been prevented from holding any plant elections during the next six months to determine representatives for collective bargaining. When essentially the same terms as these were advanced several weeks ago by the steel industry, the union officials rejected them, and, fortunately, they rejected them again last week.

One can understand, of course, why the steel companies are determined to prevent the Labor Board from holding elections. The one election that it has held—at the West Virginia Rail Company—resulted in an overwhelming victory for the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers. It is not unlikely that other elections would bring further victories for the Amalgamated. And if majority rule were to be enforced, this would mean the beginning of the end of company unions in steel. Thus for labor to yield on majority rule would clearly jeopardize its fight for genuine collective bargaining. Moreover, to accept the principle of proportional representation as part of the "truce"—even for six months—might seriously weaken labor's fight to keep the same principle out of the new labor bill.

In the automobile industry, President Roosevelt's joint commission of inquiry, composed of N.R.A. and Labor Department officials, is proceeding along curious lines in its effort to study the working conditions of automobile

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers. It is excluding all testimony on grievances concerning violations of Section 7a as well as criticism of the President's Automobile Labor Board. Whether this ruling is to be interpreted as revealing once more the President's partiality toward proportional representation, which he made a part of the automobile settlement last March, it is difficult to say. But certainly it is unfortunate that the committee is merely collecting data on hours and wages. Such information is interesting and valuable no doubt, but it constitutes only part of the diagnosis.

The most important problem in the automobile field is to find out why the workers have repudiated the Automobile Labor Board. Last week at the plant of the Cadillac Motor Company, this board conducted its first election to determine representatives on a proportional-bargaining basis, but the United Automobile Workers' Federal Labor Union told its members not to vote. Why? The reasons should be of real value, especially in the drafting of new labor legislation. Labor leaders have repeatedly complained that proportional representation is a device for dividing rather than uniting workers. It gives employers the opportunity of sponsoring company unions and playing them against independent unions. The decisions of the National Labor Relations Board show quite clearly that this is what happened at the Kohler Company in Wisconsin and at the Houde Company in Buffalo. The testimony of the automobile workers on Section 7a and on proportional representation as a means for achieving real collective bargaining should, accordingly, be welcomed. Without such testimony, the present investigation is "puerile, childish and in suppression of important facts," as it has been described by Maurice Sugar, attorney for the Mechanics' Educational Society of America, an independent union of tool and die makers.

When the Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company threatened to close all its Cleveland stores, this was interpreted by some as a warning to retail employees all over the country that they should not organize. The warning, if such it was, has not been very effective. In Milwaukee, 600 employees of The Boston Store have been on strike for three weeks, in the first department-store strike in the country. By mass picketing, the strikers have seriously reduced the Christmas sales of the store—so seriously that they were offered wage increases of about 25 percent if they would return to work. But since the store was unwilling to recognize the union, the strike continues. Meanwhile, the clerks at two clothing stores in New York City have gone on strike, and the employees of the James Butler Grocery Company, a chain system, have threatened to strike. The Butler company, according to the union, closed 80 of its 670 stores, putting 200 employees out of work, in order to break up the union. In New York City also, the independent Pharmacists' Union has recently won a strike against 250 drug stores, obtaining recognition and better working conditions for the employee pharmacists. The significance of these strike activities of white-collar workers is that five years ago they would have been considered not only impossible but ridiculous. Credit the N.R.A. on the educational side.

Mr. Redfern Mason was the distinguished music critic of The San Francisco Examiner for twenty-five years. But a few weeks ago he made the mistake of accepting the chairmanship of The Examiner unit of the Newspaper Guild. In that position he succeeded Louis Burgess, the editorial writer discharged by Mr. Hearst shortly after he had been elected president of the San Francisco chapter of the Guild. Well, to make a long story short, Mr. Mason is no longer music critic for Mr. Hearst. He has just resigned, having been ordered to collect and write hotel news. Mr. Hearst has not yet declared that this change in Mr. Mason's work was necessary to protect the freedom of the press, but the announcement may be expected any minute.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

CORRESPONDENCE

A Grecian Controversy

SIR: After reading the most remarkable anthology of poetry ["Eight Proletarian Poets"] in your issue of November 28, I feel moved to comment somewhat. . . . For some reason, not quite clear to me I confess, Mr. Neugass thinks it necessary, in order to eulogize the accomplishment of certain striking Greek seamen, to launch an attack on "their lying history." I should like to suggest to Mr. Neugass that most of the lies he denounces have been invented by himself. . . . It seems that someone ought to call to Mr. Neugass' attention the fact that the Greek states were not and cannot be made into miniature models of a modern nation. It would indeed be difficult to declare a war "at the command of the state pederasts, the philosophers and priests," when the matter was as thoroughly discussed by every member of the state who cared to participate as the matter of next week's production is discussed by the workers in a socialist fact ry. He might recall that the greatest force for the greatest war of the Greeks was not a philosopher or priest, not even an aristocrat, but a good proletarian son of a tanner. In fact, he might recall that that war was almost entirely the delight of the proletarians and the grief of the rich landholders.

In short, Mr. Neugass seems to have attributed most of the vices of all ancient civilizations to Greece, and in addition some that never existed. "Whores for the temples"—if he would look at the ground plan of a temple, he might see that there was no place to keep them. Perhaps it is quibbling to suggest that wine was an article of Greek export, not import. Or to hold that "argosy" can scarcely be used by metonymy for "ship."

But this is growing tiresome. In conclusion I should like to ask if by any chance Mr. Neugass thinks the Dodecanese is a sea.

Cambridge, Mass. ROBERT O. SCHLAIFER.

SIR: Of course there were juries and popular assemblies and elections in the gold-plated ages of ancient Greece; after the expulsion of the tyrants: yet the paid jurymen were familiar with their own uselessness; the demagogues led the popular assemblies around by the nose; the wider were the pretensions at democracy, the more effectively was tyranny apt to take hold—according to Aristophanes, who also complained that pederasts were being sprinkled about in too many responsible positions; and the *hetairai* —political-social clubs—dominated the elections and shaped the government of Athens into a good working model of any American political machine, with imperialist trimmings in addition.

It is as senseless to claim proletarian birth for Cleon—a hide magnate and the son of a hide magnate—as it is to reason upon the fact that Jay Gould was a farmer's son, or that Jim Fisk was the son of a tin peddler, or that the owner of the Autolite plant in Toledo was, at one time, a mechanic. . . . It is true that war was the grief of rich Greek landholders—those of them whose chief holdings were large country estates, and who stood to make nothing by war. Those who had a nickel in the kitty were as willing as their counterparts are now. As for whores and temples, Strabo mentions that there were as many as one thousand temple-whores kept on call at one time in Corinth. All . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Mediterranean, both Greek and Asiatic whores thronged about the temples, which played, in this connection, the role of modern hotels and bars. As early as the fifth century B. C., Athens was forced to import wines, because of its small production and large consumption of this commodity, and I never said that the Dodecanese Islands were a sea. . . .

JAMES NEUGASS.

New York City.

A Museum of Capitalistic Decay

SIR: Commonwealth College has started a Workers' Museum of Capitalistic Decay, to house tangible proofs that the Oppression is over, now that the fat boy has killed the thing he loves best. Here we are building a complete record of the collapse of capitalism while it is still in process and the records of the collapse are at hand to preserve and classify. . . . We invite persons throughout the country to send in all horrible examples of profit, interest and rent, ballyhoo of promotion, overproduction, overselling, by capitalist-kept press, pulpit, movie and radio. We want photos of unemployment, brokers' rooms papered with worthless securities, penthouse princesses in $80 shoes and $50 stockings sniffing $30 bottles of French scent. Also, for contrast, shoes made of discarded auto tires, a five-and-ten-cent store wedding ring, or the human harness now used by farmers who can't even afford a mule.

We are beginning with exhibits small but significant. . . . Common domestic articles will be welcome, such as samples of the flour-bag advertised by Sears for clever housewives to turn into lingerie. But we would make room for one of those Civil War muskets Morgan resold to the government at a 100-percent profit. All exhibits should be sent to Commonwealth College, Mena, Arkansas.

CHARLOTTE MOSKOWITZ,
Executive Secretary.

Mena, Ark.

Strachey and Fascism

SIR: The editorials in the Hearst papers. The cartoons. The Daily News slogan of "Give C.C.C. Boys Guns." The activities of the "patriotic" organizations that long so innocently for the days when Americans were of "pure" stock. The astounding revelations of the Nye munitions inquiry. The criminal-syndicalism laws in thirty-three states. . . . All pointing alarmingly to the obvious peril of a growing fascist tendency in this country.

We have asked John Strachey, author of "The Coming Struggle for Power," to report on the worldwide interrelationship of war and fascism, with particular reference to the present situation in America. The meeting will take place Friday, December 28, at 8:30 P.M. in Mecca Temple, and will mark his initial appearance here this season. During January he will speak in other cities.

We feel that Mr. Strachey's address is no mere private lecture for a selected group of esthetes, or for some particular group adhering to any single political formula. . . . We hope to enlist more and more people in the vital struggle the American League Against War and Fascism is conducting against war, and its twin menace, fascism.

CARL PORTER,
For the New York City Committee of the
American League Against War and Fascism.

New York City.

Hessians in China

SIR: In The China Weekly Review of October 6, 1934, there is an illustrated advertisement of a new type of a fighting plane used by the United States army. Underneath this advertisement is a news item reporting the arrival in China of the first shipment of these planes in an order placed by the Chinese government in this country. Then follows the information of the arrival of a certain pursuit officer of the United States army who has been given leave of absence for the purpose of demonstrating these planes. I understand that the Nye Committee investigating merce has been assisting private corporations to obtain aviators for enlistment in China who had previously served in the armed forces of the United States. Such practices as these seem to me to amount to intervention *de facto* if not *de jure*, and of course they are being done without any warrant of Congress. . . .

If the American nation is going to supply "Hessians" in the revolutionary struggle in China, at least it ought to be done by decision of their representatives and not by arbitrary acts of executive officers.

HARRY F. WARD.

New York City.

[We have inquired of the War Department and learn that the officer to whom Dr. Ward apparently refers is a member of the Reserve and as such reverts to civilian status when not on active duty. With his general point we are wholly in agreement.—THE EDITORS.]

About Bertrand Russell's Book

SIR: The review of my "Freedom versus Organization, 1814-1914," by Mr. Lewis Mumford in your issue of October 17, gives me occasion to mention what ought to have been stated in the Preface, that the book was originally conceived on a wider scale, but that I found it necessary to reserve for a later volume the matters with which, in Mr. Mumford's opinion, I ought to have dealt along with what is strictly political or economic. There is a set of interconnected movements—Wesleyanism, sensibility, the romantic movement, tractarianism and ultramontanism—which were of great, though not primarily political, importance. The nineteenth century is so complex that some principle of dissection is necessary, not only geographically but as to the aspects discussed. I hope, at no distant date, to deal with the matters that Mr. Mumford finds omitted, in collaboration with Peter Spence, to whom the plan of it is due.

Meanwhile, I would point out that I was dealing with "the main causes of political change," and that Sir Walter Scott, for example, neither desired nor caused change. The non-rational forces, except in Germany, were, in the main, opposed to the political changes which occurred during the first three-quarters of the century.

BERTRAND RUSSELL.

Petersfield, Eng.

Extracts from Letters

A LETTER from Minna F. Kassner, 1359 Broadway, New York City, says that she is engaged in the preparation of a survey for the American Civil Liberties Union on the subject of radio censorship. She asks that any of our readers who know of instances of radio censorship communicate with her at once.

J. M. Hone, Kildare Street Club, Dublin, Ireland, is at work on a book to be called "The Life and Letters of George Moore." He writes: 'As many individuals in America have been in correspondence with Mr. Moore, I am anxious to obtain from them the use of the originals or copies of his correspondence with them." All communications for Mr. Hone should be directed to his Dublin address.

James R. Eckman, of Minneapolis, Minnesota, takes issue with the recent statement of The New Republic that the position of the Farmer-Labor Party was "further strengthened" in his state as the result of the November elections. He points out that the popular vote for Governor Floyd B. Olson was 522,438 in 1932 and only 468,812 in 1934. He also calls attention to the fact that the Farmer-Labor congressional delegation was reduced to three, whereas the Republican delegation was increased to five.

Alfred Klausler, 519 South Nowlan Street, Glendive, Montana, seeks information regarding Walter Thomas Mills, author of "The Struggle for Existence." He asks that readers of The New Republic who know anything about Mr. Mills's present

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congratulations

Sailors of Cattaro, by Friedrich Wolf, translated by Keene Wallis, adapted by Michael Blankfort. Civic Repertory Theatre, December 10, 1934.

AS FOR the Theatre Union, their advance from their first production to the beginning of their second season is encouraging for our whole theatre. Compared with "Peace on Earth," "Sailors of Cattaro" is not only more even and economical technically, with less noise and spotty insistence, it is more secure and unified as dramatic emotion. The company plays together well, with a good variety in types, but with none of the feeble stressing of type personalities that so often is made to take the place of acting. Mr. Mordecai Gorelik has succeeded in really dramatic settings. The design and the lighting in them are inseparable, which should be the most obvious principle in stage décor, I suppose, though it usually turns out not to be so. The directing by Mr. Irving Gordon is unusually good in general. I would suggest only a little less softness, more of a certain stiffening, in the players' attack and a speeding up in tempo now and then.

"Sailors of Cattaro" (N.B. The accent is on the first syllable, not the second—which brings on a nose disease—and the same is true of Spalato) parallels in story and structure the famous Russian film of some years ago, "S.S. Potemkin," that was so much better, less stupid and obvious than most of the Russian films since then. Both are founded on the pattern supplied by actual situations. Suppression, bad food and the growing sense of rights lead toward mutiny, taking control of the battleships, and struggling with decisions by councils, general ignorance and naïve conceptions of principles. Eventually the rebels are defeated—temporarily defeated is the implication—by superior resources, policy and discipline. In "Sailors of Cattaro" the red flag comes in as a symbol of human aspiration on one hand and on the other of threat and social upheaval. It is well used by the dramatist to heighten his climaxes. He is not in this respect entirely seconded by the Theatre Union company. The poignancy of the red flag's meaning for these simple sailors and the affront of its revolutionary taint for the officers could be more emphasized, above all in the acting.

There are two ways by which the impact of this production would be strengthened. We could have more men, more people on the stage, in masses, the picture of the human mass in struggle and crisis. This, of course, cannot necessarily be demanded of a theatre organization. It is a case where the films enjoy an advantage, since they are able to command whole waves of noise and silence, crowds and solitude, and vast tides of movement. Or, lacking mass quantity, we could have—and can fairly demand—an intensification of the playing in the chief roles.

A good deal of one side in the grapple of forces represented in this drama is embodied in the lieutenant who bullies the crew, and in the captain whose poise and "psychological," as he calls it, technique prevent or ease the crises that threaten. Mr. Frederick Roland plays the captain well; the lieutenant is played up to the hilt by Mr. James MacDonald, with the right nervous venom and authority, and with more modulation and variety than the immediate surface of his performance might reveal to us. Mr. MacDonald gives the outstanding performance of the evening. Mr. Tom Powers, who carries so much of the other side in the dramatic struggle, is less successful. To this character of Franz Rausch, who passes from a petty officer, secretly sympathetic with the crew, to the revolutionary commandant, is entrusted a great range of emotional reaction, theory and practical problems. Mr. Powers plays his first scenes well, but does not put concentration and pressure enough into the rest of his performance. At the end of the first third of it he appears to give himself a bouquet and let it go at that. He shows more natural facility than condensed design, his resources and effects are all used up before he gets to his last scene. Towards this scene all Mr. Powers' playing should have been a careful and profound gradation, for here we have the final insoluble human tragedy to which this drama's situation, pattern and argument must (in this play as in all art) constantly return. Repeated performances should help all the players in this scene toward the tragic effect, half-mechanical, half-mystical, that the dramatist provides.

It can also be said of the Theatre Union's production that an unusual number of the smaller roles, to be seen rather than listed, are played well. What needs now to go forward is the sense of ideas, moving powers, released emotions and individual human wills, as they clash and subside, mount toward climaxes, recede into the still, small voice of the single soul. Shelley said that incest was the greatest tragic dramatic motif, meaning that it can arouse the greatest range of human reactions. The players should study the central theme of "Sailors of Cattaro" with an eye on its latent powers of upheaval. Even this piece of advice amounts to saying that the Theatre Union's venture is one of the best things in town.

"Calling All Stars" (Hollywood Theatre) at least serves to remind us that once in musical revues there were more of such horrors as those dancing chorus numbers. It can also remind Messrs. Lou Holtz and Phil Baker that mere personal exhibition, humorous self-confidence and somewhat faded dear-boyism are not enough by a long shot. In "Calling All Stars" they are inexcusably tiresome. By contrast we can realize how grateful we should be to such a spirit in musical comedy as Mr. Cole Porter. The one important item is that this revue presents a remarkable comic, Miss Judy Canova, who sings the North Carolina hill-billy songs. In a certain natural, out-giving and abundant quality, she surpassed even Beatrice Lillie. A talent appears in Miss Canova that has great possibilities for managers to snatch at.

It seems worth while to say that Mr. Maxwell Anderson's "Valley Forge" at the Guild Theatre has gone on upward in my thoughts as the inadequacy of the production has faded out, and the general character of the play remained vivid. I am more and more impressed with the dramatist's achievement in creating a Washington that is neither silly and destructive nor high-horse and hokum. There is to it an emotional amplitude, and at the same time concentration, that realistic drama rarely gives us and that poetic drama all too often fumbles.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STARK YO

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Literature and Politics

I AM NOT going to review John Strachey's new essay, except by saying that it is short, clear and has nothing portentous about it except the title.[1] All those who are interested in the hotly argued relationship between literature and politics should read it for themselves; they will find that this booklet of twelve thousand words has more good sense in it than have most critical essays five times its length. But Strachey makes one point about which I am dubious.

The point has to do with the attitude to be adopted by Marxist critics toward writing as a fine art. Here Strachey differs with Granville Hicks. He approaches their difference in the politest manner possible and with the warmest praise for Hicks's critical achievements, yet there is no mistaking the tone of reproof in his voice. "It does seem to me," he says, "that Hicks falls sometimes into an error which, as I was suggesting above, is a tempting one for Marxist critics. He hardly seems to pay enough attention to the merits of writers as writers. . . . It would be a thousand pities if his strong sense of responsibility, as the foremost Marxist literary critic of America, which he *certainly is, should force him to stifle his esthetic sensi*bility."

Strachey himself avoids this error by retaining and exercising a keen sense of esthetic values. Before attacking a writer for political reasons, he almost always stops to explain that he has a high regard for the writer's distinction of style or choice of images. Indeed, he carries his appreciation so far that I wonder whether it doesn't encourage a state of mind and a practice of criticism that are even more dangerous than Hicks's forthright abuse of his political enemies. Take for example the passage that precedes his attack on Archibald MacLeish:

> It would obviously be a sheer waste of time to talk about Mr. MacLeish's poem unless its author had the talent to make a true poem. . . . It is, as a matter of fact, precisely because Mr. MacLeish is a writer of a high order of ability that it is worth while to point out what he is writing about. From the very outset, our method of criticism must depart from the established methods of bourgeois criticism. Bourgeois criticism is in the main an attempt to establish a hierarchy of works of art, to say that this poem is better than that, but not so good as a third, etc., etc. We are not primarily concerned with this question. Obviously we shall only discuss works that do succeed in expressing adequately what their authors meant to express. But what we are here and for the moment concerned with is the thing expressed.

In other words, Strachey sets up an arbitrary distinction between "expressing adequately" and "the thing expressed" —that is, between style or form and intellectual content or subject-matter. Bourgeois criticism is supposed to evaluate the one; Marxist criticism is here and for the moment strictly confined to the other. Now, it was long ago discovered—and it is rediscovered by each new generation—that nobody can drive a barbed-wire fence through a work of art and divide it like a cattle range. Form and substance are intermingled. A writer's technical equipment almost always helps to determine his choice of subject. Even more fatally, his opinions and ambitions and social allegiances have an effect on his technical equipment; style is the man. If the Marxist critics followed Strachey's suggestion—if they dealt only with works that someone else had declared to be technically competent, and merely discussed their political significance, they would confine themselves to stating partial truths and, eventually, would bore and alienate their readers. The formula of criticizing books solely in the light of the fascist or anti-fascist ideas in them is altogether too easy to follow.

But this method that Strachey seems to recommend—fortunately without himself following it too strictly—has still another danger, in this case arising from a universal human habit of seeing our enemies larger than life. We tend to overestimate both their ability or cunning and their danger to mankind. Strachey, for example, considerably exaggerates the literary value of the "Frescoes for Mr. Rockefeller's City." The poem is not on a level with MacLeish's permanent work: it is a long, vigorous, loose-jointed piece of poetical pamphleteering not likely to outlast the age that called it forth. As for its political significance, Strachey proves beyond a doubt that it contains strong traces of what Michael Gold called "the fascist unconscious," but this fact is losing its importance now that wholly conscious fascism is becoming prevalent among us. In the past, some writers with hidden fascist tendencies have learned to recognize and avoid them. The tactical danger in MacLeish's case is that he will say to himself—and perhaps has already said, who knows?—"These Communist boys are nasty, but maybe they're right after all. They say that I am a very important poet and am getting to be a fascist Well, the thing to do is to make myself still more of a fascist and thereby become a still more important poet."

Ernest Hemingway, also discussed by Strachey, presents another aspect of what is essentially the same problem. Strachey says that, in his last book, he "has expressed more adequately than ever before his ferocious despair at the condition of the world." After these high praises, Strachey goes on to attack his social philosophy. But the bourgeois critics, who were not interested in attacking his social philosophy, considered that his last book was at best a standing still, and was quite possibly a retreat from his earlier achievements. Not yet having read "Winner Take Nothing," I am hardly qualified to comment on this difference of opinion. But it seems to me that if the Marxist critics want to write about Hemingway they must first judge his last book in relation to the others—give it a place in the hierarchy—and must then decide whether the advance or the retrogression from his earlier work has any relation with the opinions on politics, revolution and the world in general that Hemingway has lately been expressing.

This is the sort of task that Granville Hicks, for example, is always willing to undertake. His judgment of literary values is oversimplified, sometimes distorted, and Strachey's comments on what he says about particular writers are wholly justified. Yet Hicks doesn't make the mistake of limiting himself to one aspect of a writer's work. He does try to bring the whole picture together, style and message and substance, into a coherent whole. In this respect he is on the right track, even though I sometimes feel that he is

[1] Literature and Dialectical Materialism, by John Strachey.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Beard: The Planner

RARELY has a historian come down from his Olympian height with such precise plans for a single nation as has Charles Beard in his book, "The Open Door at Home."[1] I approached it with some uneasiness because several of my friends the first week in December said, "Have you read Beard's new book? He has gone isolationist."

Opening the book to page 120, I found him making fun of Raymond L. Buell of the Foreign Policy Association, for saying that the future of capitalism depends on increased foreign purchasing for our exports brought about by lowering the tariff. Beard's sharp pen has long delighted me, but it didn't seem so funny now that he was pricking one of my own pet hobbies. Reading on, I found that Beard, in spite of his rather "smarty" phrase-making, is decidedly bigger than such simple classification as "isolationist" or "internationalist." He has almost as much contempt for agrarians as he has for industrialists. His supreme interest is the national interest. He writes with more intelligent patriotism than any other American I have ever read.

The one thing he hates above everything else is imperialism. He thinks the leading nations that cultivated imperialist policies during the nineteenth century are now beginning to reap the tares and thistles they have sown. Imperialism he defines as an effort on the part of the dominant industrial and financial forces of a nation to send its surplus capital and commodities abroad in preference to raising the standard of living of its people at home. In the United States, President McKinley started the imperialistic game. This whole sickening round, which involves colonial possessions, spheres of influence, a large navy and the policy of applying pressure and coercion in order to force outlets for the surpluses of American industry and agriculture, has been described and denounced more vividly by Beard than by anyone else. He says, concerning the subsidized merchant marine as an agent of imperialism:

> For years the governments of industrial nations have been straining every nerve to outstrip one another in merchant shipping, as an instrument of commerce and a naval auxiliary. They have poured billions into subsidies, with accompanying corruption, fraud and inefficiency, and have brought about an overexpansion of shipping, with decreased earnings which have only augmented the clamor of private interests for more bounties from treasuries. At bottom, this marine rivalry is a part of naval rivalry and is involved in that issue. If naval rivalry cannot be positively restrained by international agreement, and competition in merchant shipping continues, they will exhaust public treasuries and culminate in the only possible outcome—the destructiveness of war, with results incalculable in terms of national security.

In his discussion of agrarian statecraft, Beard assumes that the central policy is "low tariffs." Frankly I question whether this chapter, which is somewhat of an argument for a continuation of high tariffs in the United States at the present time, does much credit to Beard as an economist. But his testimony as a historian is quite impressive. And, of course, he may be right that the economists of the United States today have been seriously infected by the rationalizing of the British free-trade economists of a century ago. Unfortunately Beard has not lived as close to the leaders of agrarian statecraft during the past quarter of a century as is necessary for a really authoritative pronouncement. Until rather recently, the farmers have been more interested in getting special privileges for themselves than in taking away special privileges from someone else. Even Southern farmers have apparently been more interested in getting tariffs on vegetable oils, peanuts, sugar and tropical vegetables than they have in lower tariffs on industrial products. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the processing tax serves as the farmer's tariff. The National Grange has long been a high-tariff organization. The American Farm Bureau, in spite of the efforts of its President, Ed O'Neal, from Alabama, has, on the whole, played the high-tariff game.

While probably more farmers are in favor of lower industrial tariffs today than ever before in the United States, I fear that the agrarian statecraft of a great many of them consists simply in the following: "We intend to raise all we can and get a fair price for it." If the people of the United States are unable to consume their output at a fair price, they believe in dumping the surplus on the world and are surprised to find that the world isn't as thankful as it was before the World War. During the past two years, millions of farmers have outgrown this childish attitude but, even now, commission men, exporters and others interested in the volume of farm produce they handle, work on farmers quite successfully to urge the maximum of production for a market that no longer exists except at a price that means peonage for American farmers.

On the subject of farm policy, Beard quotes me as follows:

> If we continue toward nationalism we must be prepared to make permanent the withdrawal from cultivation of over fifty million acres of good farmland, and face the consequences of all the social and economic dislocations which are bound to ensue.

And then referring to the middle course which I presented as an alternative to this, he says:

> His program of protection and realization for agriculture is to force dislocations and readjustments in industry, by reducing the tariff, by destroying rights vested under previous tariff policy, and by importing an additional $500,000,000 worth of industrial commodities, in the hope of saving 25,000,000 acres of farmland for their possessors. Likewise, on their side, industrialists have shown themselves willing, and are still willing, to dislocate historic agriculture and force readjustments there. In other words, policy is to be special interest. There is no ambiguity about that. Politics is to continue as an open struggle among special interests, with what long-term outcome for the nation no one knows, although the present impasse in which such a struggle has eventuated is well known.

I must confess it is a little disturbing to find Beard looking on my middle-course proposal as special pleading. It had seemed to me that the dislocations caused to agriculture and to industry were about even under this proposal. Furthermore, I have from time to time, in the advocacy of a great increase in imports to restore agricultural markets, suggested that the shock of such increased imports to vested interests might be broken by special governmental action. Also I have pointed out from time to time that the increased purchasing power coming to export agriculture and export industry, as a result of increased imports into this country, would result in greatly increased activity among

[1] The Open Door at Home, by Charles A. Beard. New York: The Macmillan Co. $2.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

status of labor generally might be greatly improved even though it might be necessary for the government to take care of the labor displaced in certain specialized and inefficient industries.

I fear that my review, like Beard's book, does not get down to the really interesting part until the last. He realizes that, since the World War, we have had a long drawn-out stalemate between conflicting interests which has proved terribly disastrous. A decision must be reached. The method of the decision, according to the American tradition, consists of three parts, as follows: (1) Formulate the new policy; (2) take it to the country, debate it and get it adopted; (3) after you get the mandate, carry it into execution.

The Beard policy that is taken to the country for debate by his book, has for its essential background the terrible fear that the United States may get into war. He was deeply disturbed by the careless way in which we loaned money abroad during the 1920's. With the United States such a dominant commercial factor in world affairs, he questions our ability to stay neutral in case war breaks out somewhere else in the world and quotes Charles Warren's article in the April, 1934, Foreign Affairs as to the type of legislation we must have in order to enable us to remain neutral for any great length of time in case there is another serious war overseas. Beard doesn't like the idea of sending great quantities of either commodities or American capital abroad. He thinks American capital, American labor and American farmers have enough to do to make the United States the right kind of a place in which to live. He believes that unless the financial people cannot become as excited about opportunities at home as they have been excited about opportunities abroad, it may be necessary for the government to take increasing quantities of their money away from them by taxation. And he recognizes that, if our labor and capital are devoted more exclusively toward supplying domestic needs, it may be necessary to lay more emphasis on the intellectual, esthetic and scientific forces of the nation to the end that we have more people employed to enable us to enjoy art, recreation and the pleasures of nature and science.

Charles Beard, at heart, is an esthetic, a believer in the Good Life according to academic standards. I am inclined to think that most of his objectives are sound and that they will appear so as soon as the American people are really hungry for them. But on questions of tactics and methods, his judgment is less certain. I have the uneasy feeling that Beard in his approach skates too easily over the economic surface of the American situation.

I should judge that his proposal would result in losing foreign markets for the product of at least forty million acres of crop land. He lightly assumes that a domestic market for the product of this land could be created almost at once by an act of the national will. As a matter of technical fact, two very definite things would be necessary in the creation of a domestic market for the product of these extra forty million acres; first it would be absolutely essential to get the greater part of the unemployed at work on the job of increasing the national output of industrial goods to a point at least 40 percent above 1929. It would then be necessary to shift the greater part of the land, and the people who have been producing farm products for export, into the job of producing farm products, fruits, vegetables and meats. This kind of thing can be done in ten years, but it cannot be accomplished without great confusion during the next two or three years. It may be permissible for a historian to neglect the time factor, but those who are in the midst of business and political affairs can never forget it.

Beard quite rightly states that the national objectives in their final analysis are ideal in nature, assertions of values which cannot be proved by any system of reasoning. But in discussing possible objectives, it would seem to be exceedingly wise for the American people to use mechanistic economics in weighing the respective advantages and disadvantages of the alternative courses. Beard, in his approach, quite definitely rejects a further continuance of the experimental approach of President Roosevelt and wants to get down to careful planning both externally and internally at the earliest possible moment. Unfortunately, he has not considered in any detail the very real dislocations that would be brought about by his plan to the farmers of the Middle West and South, and the various types of industries dependent on them. Neither has he presented with sufficient vigor the problem of political resistance to the very real degree of so-called regimentation, external and internal, that would be necessary to carry out his program.

In discussing the various issues with the people of the United States there is nothing to be gained by covering up the economic and spiritual costs of the different possible alternative approaches; neither the path of nationalism nor of internationalism, nor a planned middle course, should be made to appear too rosy. The essential thing is that sooner or later there must be a decision. Beard is quite right in likening this period to that just before the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, when the Federalists, appalled by the anarchy of the day, appealed to the people to support a social document designed to bring order out of chaos. It would seem that the time has arrived for launching a New Federalist to discuss the issues of our present day as significantly as did the Federalist papers of 1787. I should suggest Charles A. Beard himself as its ideal editor.

Beginning on page 287 of his book, he gets down to definite suggestions. He would establish a Foreign Trade Corporation or monopoly which would have complete control over all exports from the United States and all imports into the United States. All industries that import goods would report their needs and the Foreign Trade Corporation would work out quotas on each of the commodities. The producers and manufacturers of foreign countries might perhaps be called upon to make bids to supply the import needs of the United States. The exports of the United States might perhaps also be sold on an auction basis. According to Beard, the prime consideration of the whole process would be

> . . . the utmost insulation of internal price levels from the disrupting influence of international trade activities —*wars, dumping, revolutions and price-cutting conflicts.* Dumping would be ruled out entirely. The irresponsible exchange of goods, as now carried on solely for the largest possible profit, would likewise be ruled out, so that international trade would not become a savage competition in the reduction of standards of living.

He would have imports consist largely of luxury or cultural goods, and would modify the Tariff Act to enable the Foreign Trade Corporation to transfer commodities from the free list to the dutiable list and *vice versa.* He would have it possible for the corporation to shift tariff rates in view of the economic situation, but always with the idea of maintaining the internal price level with the least possible disturbance. As for the private interests in the import and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

export business, they would not necessarily be driven out of it, but they would inevitably be relegated to positions of much less influence and power. Perhaps in the past they have had altogether too much power, power that has involved public support running into the hundreds of millions of dollars, to enable them to do business in foreign lands.

In this connection, Beard observes:

> The promotion of foreign trade by the engines of state, as a good in itself or as a profit-making enterprise, inevitably thrusts American private interests into the heart of other nations, spreads them to all parts of the world, and provokes rivalries and conflicts in widely scattered places which cannot be defended by the American navy as now constituted or by any American navy that opposing governments or combinations of governments will permit the United States to build before striking—as Great Britain, France, Japan and the United States struck at Germany. The solution to this problem is not to be found, therefore, as many naval bureaucrats insist, in more and more naval construction, but in the withdrawal of public support from private interests engaged in making outward thrusts perilous to security, and in the public control of foreign trading operations, in the interest of security.

Security, once more, is his measure of all things. Beard predicts, however, that his proposed system will have other virtues as well, and I think that he opens himself to a flank attack by claiming too much for it. One sentence in particular presents an outstanding contradiction:

> It is probable that under a regime of economic security and efficient industry, the foreign trade of the United States would materially increase, for the full use of the American endowment would create a national buying power of enormous proportions and a corresponding demand for foreign commodities of peculiar distinction; but the imports thus stimulated and permitted would be, in the main, luxuries and objects of appreciation and enjoyment not indispensable to the security and basic standard of life of the American people.

Even though the great imports from abroad can be dispensed with, without serious damage, in case the nation producing them gets into war, it must be remembered they are also performing the function of providing purchasing power for American cotton, lard, wheat, tobacco, automobiles, etc., and if their importation is shut off by war, there will be inevitable repercussions on our domestic industry. Yes, I fear Beard has been rationalizing his fundamental prejudices in much the same way as any of the rest of us. Nevertheless, I must admit the man has a better historic sweep than most of us, even though as an economic technician he may be a little misinformed as to the nature of certain difficulties in his nationalistic approach.

Perhaps some day the American nation will have to adopt his Foreign Trade Corporation. Certain actions by foreign nations may compel it. On the other hand, if we adopt such a corporation, we in turn will compel similar action by foreign nations, even as the actions thus far adopted by them played a significant part in the congressional delegation of tariff powers in the Tariff Act of 1934. If the Foreign Trade Corporation is set up with the powers suggested by Beard, the operation of it will be one of the most gigantic tasks ever undertaken by this nation.

In the last two or three pages of his book, Beard dreams a great dream of a beautiful and peaceful future of our great land [illegible] nations, "fighting like cats and dogs over crumbs of trade." We would stay at home and provide an adequate army, navy, aviation force and coast defenses to take care of the United States proper, setting an example to other nations of a land at peace and a happy race of people engaged in promoting high living standards and an appreciation of all that is finest and best. The heart thrills to all of this, but I fear that even Beard has not seen the whole problem. He is not quite so good an economic technician as he is a historian. I wish he were, because his contribution would then be even more significant. In the meantime, I trust his book will be debated up and down the breadth of the land this winter.

HENRY A. WALLACE.

The Passion of Alex Maury

Alex Maury, Sportsman, by Caroline Gordon. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

THIS IS the story of Alex Maury, born to spend his boyhood in the planting ranks of a Virginia community shortly after the Civil War. This society, politically and economically, had been ruined; but its manners and customs, always the last things in a culture to go, preserved the inherited routine of life until his early manhood. Indeed, they took on a degree of intensity that only the sense of approaching death can give. There was about the instruction of youth, the amenities of the neighborhood gatherings and sports, fishing, shooting and fox-hunting—but especially the last-named because of its more elaborate form—the magnitude of a great wake at which this county society foregathered to bid farewell to itself. The boy, Alex, brought up in his uncle's house, was to receive his education at the very center of this exciting situation. From his aunt, a very fine classical scholar, he got a firm grounding in the humanities; but it was from his uncle, the local nabob and especially distinguished as the owner of Old Mag and Whiskey, the finest fox hounds in the community, that he acquired the special training which made it possible for him to pursue his life's passion, as Whiskey in one of the book's most exciting episodes finally brings his life-long enemy, Old Red, to the kill.

Indeed, the story of Alex Maury is the history of a passion. But it is on no small sentimental scale. It is, in a sense, a prose Aeneid, written with so much economy and constraint that the reader is only aware at the end that he has been following the wanderings of a hero. For like Aeneas, when his Troy fell down, Alex Maury fled from the scenes dear to his memory never to return. He founded no new Virginia, but in his dislocation he became the ideal of that sporting blood which the manhood of the Old Dominion could only approach in better days. His adventures were not on seas, but on perfect fishing streams and shooting grounds. There were no gods to direct him: only inherited tastes and an unerring instinct for fish and birds. The ordinary ties that most people live for, marriage and an ambitious livelihood, were in his case the storms and hazards that rose up to deflect him from his purpose. But he managed to ride them, steering safely between the Scylla of his wife's mother and the emotional Charybdis of family ties.

It takes a man of heroic proportions to maintain all his life the terrific physical, mental and sensuous discipline that the fullest enjoyment of such a passion demands. In Alex Maury's study of the habits and characteristics of fish, the fox and birds, the powers of his imagination are extended

LICENSED TO ONE COPY ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and dogs. In his own way he lives a complete life that no dilettante of field and stream and no professional sportsman ever knows. The dilettante, wherever found, is the product of a dislocation in society, just as Alex Maury is: but the dilettante, lacking both in passion and the fixity of a culture to support him, must forever be the frustrated, incomplete individual, spiritually lost, sampling everything but enjoying nothing.

The author has performed a very difficult technical feat. She has made hunting and angling appear so exciting that a reader who has never had a gun or rod in his hand will not lay down the book until he has reached the end. This is because she presents a protagonist equal to his passion, and because she makes the action rise naturally out of his character, just as the protagonist rises naturally from his background. After sociological and propaganda novels, here is a purer type of fiction.

ANDREW NELSON LYTLE.

A Study, Slightly Previous

Leisure: a Surburban Study, by George A. Lundberg, Mirra Komarovsky, Mary Alice McInerny. New York: Columbia University Press. 396 pages. $3.

"LEISURE" is the end-product of a survey, carried out in considerable detail, of the leisure-time activities and facilities of the inhabitants of Westchester County, New York. Apparently the job took not much less than three years, and the results incorporated in the present study will provide, one should think, an index covering practically every use of leisure in Westchester about which anyone might be curious, except adultery. The county government's part in culture and recreation—quite an important one in Westchester—municipal, community and group efforts in the same field, and even the experience of individuals in leisure time, receive substantial attention.

Given this body of information, there remained the problem of relating it pertinently to general social need; and it is here that the authors have failed, as probably any authors would. They spin brave cables of words, feeble and fallacious, and their bridge is all stresses and strains, hardly able to carry the necessary conviction of the work's worth in the eyes of the sponsors.

The basic fallacy selected by the authors to justify their project is that until a recent stage of technological advance was reached, "hard and constant work by the great masses of the adult population and a large proportion of the children was an imperious requirement" in the avoidance of actual famine; and that, with the achievement of present technological facilities, the major obstacle to extensive, comfortable leisure for the masses has been removed. That this myth should still solemnly be put forth to protect the house of cards of orthodox sociology is perhaps an indication of the atrophy of the inventive faculty of the practitioners. Almost any American provincial family knows that its great-grandparents had to turn their surplus grain into whiskey to get any good out of it, and that scarcity came to the American back country with the advance of technology, systematized commerce and stable finance. If the bankers had succeeded in suppressing all history but their own version since 1800, a lot of folks would still be wise on this point. The pontifical sponsors of "Leisure" must take their prospective readers for either foundlings or fools.

The Christian Soldier

A Pilgrimage of Ideas, by Sherwood Eddy. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 336 pages. $2.50.

MR. EDDY is the true wayfaring and warfaring Christian. In this volume, which he subtitles his reëducation, he recalls his career as missionary in India and China, with the Y.M.C.A. in the War and, since then, in journeys of inquiry and evangelism, especially to Soviet Russia and the Far East. After a boyhood in the Middle West, and a rather barren academic and theological training at Yale and Union Seminary, he may claim to have made the world his university, to have sat at the feet of its wisest teachers and followed at close hand the fateful experiments of its laboratory. With such opportunities, and an open mind and active intelligence to take advantage of them, he knows the world as few men know it today, and his report, bearing on its face evidence of candor and good faith, cannot be lightly ignored.

The burden of his gospel is faith in the supernatural. This faith is the result of personal experience initiated by the ministry of D. L. Moody at Northfield, and enlarged and confirmed by events and associations of which that with Gandhi was most fruitful. Mr. Eddy does not enter largely into his theology, but he believes in a personal God who, while an essential element in the world process, is yet consciously and intelligently above it. This is not an unusual belief: the striking thing is the power of faith and love with which Mr. Eddy holds it, the energy and the emotion that it gives to his life. Religion is to him the supreme force in the world, "binding together" and giving meaning to developments in art, science, politics, social behavior. Mr. Eddy sees private capitalism as hostile to Christianity in fact, as Communism is in theory. With due apologies, we must call him a Christian Socialist.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Hope Being Abandoned

Harvest in the North, by James Lansdale Hodson. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.50.

Love on the Dole, by Walter Greenwood. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. $2.50.

THESE two books deal with the British end of what we still genteelly call the depression. They both are laid around Manchester, in that section of the western world probably most cruelly, relentlessly affected by the disintegration of the capitalistic system. Both show us, with varying degrees of vividness, the lower-class urban Englishmen who, through so many generations, have been thwarted, twisted, beaten down by industrialism, that their appearance is that of a race apart.

The two books, however, are not of the same caliber. The chief interest for an American in "Harvest in the North" is its sharp picture of the boom days in Lancashire, following the War. The speculation in cotton shares was wilder, more fantastic, even than in Wall Street in the good old days before the thirties. It resembled more the period when Florida marsh water was worth its weight in gold; it was even more spectacular. For here, instead of the participants being of a race that always hoped, anyhow, to make its fortune overnight, you have the beaten, hopeless slaves of the mills running wild; buying; trebling their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into comparative luxury. And then the debacle; the return to their jobs, if there were any—and in most cases there were no jobs; the dropping back into the brutish existence that was their heritage. In this respect the book is a document.

As a novel, however, I found it rather hard plugging. The book is windy. The pictures of the local scene, although authentic and the best thing about it, aren't vivid enough, while the characters are, for the most part, a long way from convincing: mill workers (in a realistic book) talking ninth-rate Synge; worn women who, until the boom, had scarcely ever lifted their heads from the wash tubs, tuning in on Bach fugues like veterans; a poor boy who became a hot shot, bought a couple of theatres in London, made the actors use the jokes he remembered from childhood, etc.—and filled his houses; and finally, a wealthy man and his daughter with coy conversation and comradely mugging that are a bit tough on the stomach. The story ends with the crash of the ancient industrial house of Houghton, but we are left with the impression that some day the hero will own the Houghton mills.

"Love on the Dole" is a far better book, the best I have read on any similar theme. It has a quality curiously like Dostoevsky, the quality of inevitable disaster, inexorably led to. Only, whereas in Dostoevsky the agents of disaster are human beings, illness and epilepsy, in Greenwood's book the villain is the economic set-up—a more prosaic sounding term, but as used in "Love on the Dole," actually a more devastating, terrifying one. For while the reader can always hope for escape from human beings and for recovery from illness, here, from the first, we have no hope. We know that the ambitious, idealistic 'Arry 'Ardcastle will sink always deeper in degradation, that his high-minded sister must end, as she does, little better than a prostitute. It is not the brilliancy of the writing that gives you this realization; rather you feel that the author has simply, though with shocking vividness, laid the scene before you, and then without the attempt—without the ability—to manipulate his characters to suit himself, has left them for you to see moving, shuffling, toward their inevitable doom.

WILLIAM ROLLINS, JR.

Books in Brief

Modern Prose Style, by Bonamy Dobrée. New York: The Oxford University Press. 252 pages. $2.75.

WHEN HE analyzes particular passages of modern prose in detail, as he mainly does in this book, Mr. Dobrée usually makes very good sense, and those who enjoy thinking occasionally about sentence rhythms, melodic effects and rhetorical devices, will follow him with attention and pleasure. But in his last chapters he makes a point of going well below the surface, and here he is kept from achieving a real submersion by his clinging to the old individualistic theory of style, condensed for all time in Buffon's too-famous epigram; a theory according to which, in Mr. Dobrée's words, style is "the sense of oneself, the knowledge of what one wants to say, and the saying of it in the most fitting words." As far as it goes, this is true enough, but it leaves out in the darkness the people who, by reading what a man writes, exert a powerful effect on how he says everything: like so much eighteenth and nineteenth-century thought, the theory is egocentric and unilateral; it makes no account of style as a social product; and the result is that a writer who accepts it, like Mr. between such writers as Dean Inge and Bertrand Russell, Thornton Wilder and John Dos Passos, Willa Cather and W. H. Auden.

N. A.

Papa Pasquier, by Georges Duhamel. Translated by Samuel Putnam. New York: Harper and Brothers. $2.

The chief characters in Duhamel's new novel are Raymond Pasquier, the father, who compensates for his poverty by a high moral sense and a haughty contempt for his equals, who hates politics because he is an individualist (and who, when by chance he gets some money, quickly falls prey to dishonest financiers); and his obedient and faithful wife, the model mother unable to think of anything but the welfare of her children, the glorious *mère française* of patriotic speeches. Their story, if made into a moving picture, would easily pass the strictest board of censors. It is to be feared that subsequent volumes of the Pasquier cycle will go on in the same way, glorifying the usefulness of stubborn effort, the unquestionable superiority of wisdom over science, the undeniable merits of Christian love and the overwhelming spiritual rewards of a virtuous life. And it is to be prophesied that Duhamel himself will have his virtuous ambitions crowned by being elected to the French Academy. He used to be better than that, in the old days. If, despite all its disquieting features, "Papa Pasquier" is still not unpleasant reading, it is thanks to his persistent skill as a writer, his sensitiveness and keen powers of observation. Mr. Putnam's translation is excellent.

N. G.

B'way, Inc.! The Theatre as a Business, by Morton Eustis. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 356 pages. $2.

A new variety of theatre manual. With unions and individuals in the theatre willing for the first time to coöperate to regain the respect and patronage that their medium has lost, "B'way, Inc.!" a factual presentation of the theatre as an industry with multiple ramifications, appears at an auspicious time. Here for the first time the theatre student and worker and audience-member are given every well known and little known detail of the highly organized workings of the commercial theatre, the perennial conflicts between art and business, between labor union and labor union. In addition, the author examines the business possibilities of each theatre art and trade: the opportunities and handicaps under which the producer, playwright, actor, designer, musician, chorus-member, stagehand work, and the chances for success on the part of the young person about to enter any one of these fields. An important feature of

GALA VARIETY SHOW

1. Elmer Rice
2. Puppet Show by Bunin & Cutler: "Shimche and His Yiddine, or the Landlord's Headache," an eviction skit
3. Tamiris' Dancers in a satire on charity
4. A surprise musical program
5. Same Jaffe, leading Broadway actor

NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH
66 W. 12th St., SUNDAY, DEC. 30, at 2:30 p. m.
Admission 50c and $1.00
Auspices: Interprofessional Association for Social Insurance, ben-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the book is the long appendix which makes available for the first time in complete form the texts and agreements drawn up between the producer and his employee in every field of work. S. Y.

The Best Plays of 1933-34, by Burns Mantle. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 574 pages. $3.

Mr. Burns Mantle's yearly record of the American theatre. The form of the volume follows the scheme previously employed. There is the Introduction, the record of the season in New York, Chicago, San Francisco and Southern California. The plays chosen as best deserving to be recorded at length are "Mary of Scotland," by Maxwell Anderson; "Men in White," by Sidney Kingsley; "Dodsworth," by Sidney Howard; "Ah, Wilderness!" by Eugene O'Neill; "They Shall Not Die," by John Wexley; "Her Master's Voice," by Clare Kummer; "No More Ladies," by A. E. Thomas; "Wednesday's Child," by Leopold Atlas; "The Shining Hour," by Keith Winter, and "The Green Bay Tree," by Mordaunt Shairp.

Contributors

PEGGY BACON's portrait of Roger Baldwin in this issue is the first of a series she is to do for The New Republic. A collection of Miss Bacon's portraits was recently issued by Robert McBride under the title "Off with Their Heads!"

JONATHAN MITCHELL, former newspaper man and author of "Goose Steps to Peace," has been in Washington observing and reporting the political scene. He is the author of many articles on politics and international affairs and is a regular contributor to The New Republic.

ABRAHAM EPSTEIN, author of "Insecurity: A Challenge to America," and other books on social insurance, is executive secretary of the American Association for Social Security, Inc.

JOHN LEHMANN is a young English poet whose work was included in "Eight English Poets," a poetry anthology published in The New Republic of October 17. He is the author of a volume of poetry, "A Garden Revisited."

BERGEN EVANS is an instructor of English at Northwestern University and has contributed to The Atlantic Monthly and Scribners. He assures us that every conversational statement in his sketch was made in his presence, some time or other, by persons who had degrees from well known colleges and an income of at least $25,000 a year.

HENRY A. WALLACE is Secretary of Agriculture and Administrator of the A.A.A. He is the author of "America Must Choose" and a more recently published book, "New Frontiers."

ANDREW NELSON LYTLE is the author of a biography, "Bedford Forrest and His Critter Company," and contributed to the agrarian symposium, "I'll Take My Stand." He is now farming in the South.

MURRAY GODWIN, who used to work in Henry Ford's publicity department, is now finishing a novel which is to be published in the spring. He has contributed articles and essays of criticism to many magazines.

WILLIAM ROLLINS, JR., is the author of "The Shadow Before," a novel about a New England textile strike, and is known as one of the younger proletarian novelists.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Newton Arvin, Norbert Guterman and Stark Young.

Read the most devastating criticism of the year!

AMERICA

and/or

ALFRED STIEGLITZ

By THOMAS BENTON

in the January issue of Common Sense. In the same issue: "American Standard of Dying," the sensational and documented exposure of America's gigantic funeral industry; "Abracadabra—The Way Out," Leo Huberman's amusing history of racket-panaceas for ending Depression; and a brilliant symposium on the 30-Hour Week by Stuart Chase, Francis J. Gorman and Senator Hugo Black.

Send 25c for this issue or $1.00 for six months to
COMMON SENSE, 315 Fourth Ave., N. Y. C.

The Soviet Executions Are They Justified?

JOHN HOWARD LAWSON
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD
HENRY HART: *Chairman*
CIVIC REPERTORY THEATRE, 14th St. and 6th Ave.
Sunday, December 30—8:30 P. M.
Tickets: 35c and 49c at door only
AUSPICES: National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners

Film & Photo League presents a BENEFIT PERFORMANCE OF
FOUR MARX BROS. in ANIMAL CRACKERS | WALT DISNEY'S FOUR SEASONS
DECEMBER 29, 1934
Continuous Performance 2 P. M. to Midnight
Tickets: 35c till 6 P. M.; 50c thereafter
New School for Social Research, 66 West 12th Street
ENTIRE PROCEEDS FOR "HARLEM" FILM UNIT

NEW THEATRE'S NEW YEAR'S EVE FROLIC
W. L. T. FLOOR SHOW AT MIDNIGHT
MONDAY DEC. 31st
WEBSTER HALL
119 EAST 11TH STREET

SEE
● ESTHER JUNGER
Solo Dance Star of
LIFE BEGINS AT 8:40
and
● CASTS OF
SAILORS of CATTARO
GOLD EAGLE GUY
and other current Stage Hits

Tickets: $1 in advance; $1.50, door
On Sale at
NEW THEATRE
114 W. 14 St.
nr. 6th Ave.
telephone: CH 2-9523

COOPER UNION
Dept. of Social Philosophy
(Formerly The People's Institute)
IN THE GREAT HALL
8th Street and Astor Place—at 8 o'clock
Admission Free

Friday, January 4th
EVERETT DEAN MARTIN
"The Politician"
Sunday, January 6th
DOCTOR C. R. STOCKARD
"What Can We Believe About Science."
Tuesday, January 8th
DOCTOR HENRY J. FRY
"The Biological Basis of Society: The Ancestry of Man."

Great Art Bargains
at the
JOHN REED CLUB CARNIVAL AND BAZAAR
Saturday, Dec. 29th, 1 P. M. to 3 A. M.
Germania Hall, 16th St. and 3rd Ave.
Dancing —:— *Side Shows*
Tickets: 40c; at door 50c

BETTER TIMES — the news weekly which covers all the health and welfare activities in the metropolitan New York district tersely and accurately. Sample copies upon request.
BETTER TIMES
122 East 22nd Street New York City

MUSIC LOVERS — 100,000 of the finest records in the world on sale at 50c & 75c per record (value $1.50 & $2). The Symphonies, Chamber Music, Operas, etc. of BACH, BEETHOVEN, BRAHMS, MOZART, WAGNER, etc.
MAIL ORDERS CATALOGUE THE GRAMOPHONE

LANGUAGE
Elementary and Advanced
RUSSIAN TAUGHT
Privately or in groups. Conversation and translations. Moderate rates. Address: Box

POSITION WANTED

MAN, 23, M.A., wants something real to do. Especially interested in movies, publications, psychiatry. Experience in journalism, editing, teaching, research. Been all over U. S., likes travel. Will try anything. Address: Box 878, The New Republic.

GENERAL

WHY BE DISCONTENTED? Or defeated by environment? Or depressed by loneliness? Write 434 Spokane

LICENSED FOR PERSONAL USE ONLY - NOT FOR REPRODUCTION OR DISTRIBUTION